

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

KEMP MALONE

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

HAZELTON SPENCER

C. S. SINGLETON

VOLUME LVI

1941

BALTIMORE

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

1941

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF VOLUME LVI

	PAGE
Martz, Louis L, Tobias Smollett and the <i>Universal History</i>	1
Kuirmeyer, W, German Lexicography Part VII	14
Keefer, Lubov, Pushkin and Goethe	24
Malkiel, Y, A Lexicographic Mirage	34
Frank, Grace, <i>Pathelin</i>	42
Blankenagel, J C, Jakob Wassermann's <i>Lukardis</i>	47
Heffner, R-M S, Zum Leich Walthers von der Vogelweide	54
Robertson, D W, Sidney's Metaphor of the Ulcer	56
Hummel, Ray O, Jr, Seventeenth Century Publishing Economy	61
Dorian, Donald C, "On the New Forcers of Conscience," Line 17	62
Read, William A, <i>Botango</i> , an English Ghost-Word	65
Gladding, E B, Johann Georg Jacobi's <i>Die Winterreise</i>	66
Spitzer, Leo, Glose socio-linguistique sur un usage de <i>se défendre</i>	81
Walz, John A, <i>Urfaust</i> Wer erst von Geists Erweiterung sprach'	90
Sams, Henry W, The Dual Time-Scheme in Chaucer's <i>Troilus</i>	94
McKee, K N, Voltaire's <i>Brutus</i> During the French Revolution	100
Facteau, B A, An Unpublished Letter of Fénelon	106
Spitzer, Leo, Le poêle de Descartes	110
Oake, R B, Diderot and Donne's ΒΙΑΘΑΝΑΤΟΣ	114
Fitzgerald, T A, An Echo of Our War with Mexico in a Legend of the Duque de Rivas	115
Buell, L M, A Prose Period in Shakespeare's Career?	118
Powell, William C, A Note on the Stage History of Beaumont and Fletcher's <i>Love's Pilgrimage</i> and <i>The Chances</i>	122
Halstead, W L, New Source Influence on <i>The Shoemaker's Holiday</i>	127
Allen, Don Cameron, Donne's Suicides	129
Shudofsky, M M, An Early Eighteenth-Century Rhymed Paraphrase of <i>Paradise Lost</i> , II, 1-225	133
Chne, C. L, Disraeli and John Gibson Lockhart	134
Sleeth, C R, The Friendship of Chaucer's Summoner and Pardoner	138
Bluhm, Heinz, A Supplement to Zarncke's Note on Brant's <i>Narren- schiff</i> , Cap 13, 1	139
Chappell, Louis W, Dad Sow	140
Brown, Carleton, Three Notes on the Text of the <i>Canterbury Tales</i>	163
Strathmann, E A, The Textual Evidence for "The School of Night"	176
Brewster, P G, Two Gaelic Variants of "The Two Sisters"	187
Glasheen, F J, Shelley's Use of Gray's Poetry	192
Fagin, N B, Another Reading of <i>The Turn of the Screw</i>	196
Kueth, J L, Mechanical Features of a Seventeenth Century Sub- marine .	202

	PAGE
Smyser, H M, Chaucer's Two-Mile Pilgrimage	205
Wardle, R M, The Authorship of <i>Whitehall</i> (1827)	207
Morrisette, B A, Mile Desjardins and the "Apologie du luxe"	209
Privitera, J F, The Sources of Thomas Corneille's <i>Comtesse d'Orgueil</i>	211
Aubin, R A, Nathanael Salmon on Milton, 1728	214
Gladding, E B, Housman's <i>More Poems</i> , VII and Dehmel's <i>Trost</i>	215
Walker, T C, A Note on Chateaubriand's Documentary Accuracy	217
Hamilton, D L, The Composition of Anatole France's <i>L'Orme du mail</i>	245
Workman, S K, Versions by Skelton, Caxton, and Berners of a Prologue by Diodorus Siculus	252
Peery, William, A Metrical Puzzle in the <i>Mirror for Magistrates</i>	258
Thomas, Sidney, The Elizabethan Idea of Melancholy	261
Sullivan, Frank, Cyme, a Purgative Drug	263
Dunlap, Rhodes, Some Unpublished Verses by Thomas Randolph	264
Dunlap, Rhodes, Thomas Carew, Thomas Carey, and <i>The Sovereign of the Seas</i>	268
Cawley, R R, Burton, Bacon, and Sandys	271
Stewart, B T, A Borrowing from Spenser by Phineas Fletcher	273
French, J M, The Burning of Milton's <i>Defensio</i> in France	275
Dane II, Nathan, Milton's Callimachus	278
Lumiansky, R M, A Note on Blair's Edition of <i>The Unhappy Favourite</i>	280
Larrabee, S A, The "Closet" and the "Stage" in 1759	282
Alsopach, R K, A Dublin Milton Enthusiast	284
Dennis, Leah, "Gill Morice" in the <i>Reliques</i> Again	286
Wasserman, E R, Moses Browne and the 1783 Edition of Giles and Phineas Fletcher	288
Grubb, G G, On the Serial Publication of <i>Oliver Twist</i>	290
McDavid, R I, Jr, <i>Ivanhoe</i> and Simms' <i>Vasconcelos</i>	294
Pottle, F A, The Dark Hints of Sir John Hawkins and Boswell	325
Green, H J, Fromont, a Traitor in the <i>Chansons de geste</i>	329
Feuillerat, Albert, Sur deux lettres de Baudelaire	338
Baldensperger, Fernand, A propos de "Nathaniel Hawthorne en France"	343
Buhler, C F, Sir John Paston's <i>Grete Booke</i> , a Fifteenth-Century "Best-Seller"	345
Buhler, C F, Astrological Prognostications in MS 775 of the Pierpont Morgan Library...	351
Malone, Kemp, Hygd	356
Clark, E M, A Restored Reading in the Towneley Purification Play	358
Wolfe, D M, Lilburne's Note on Milton	360
Coon, A M, Isaak Walton a Stationer?	363
Carleton, P D, John Donne's "Bracelet of Bright Hair About the Bone"	366
Niemeyer, Carl, A Misdating of "A Ballade Upon a Wedding"	368
Graham, C B., The Jonsonian Tradition in the Comedies of John Dennis	370
Wilson, J. H., Rochester's "Buffoon Conceit"	372

CONTENTS

V

	PAGE
Lang, Varley, The Character in the Elia Essays	374
Pettit, Henry, Coleridge's Mount Abora	376
Fay, E G, Borrowings from Anatole France by Willa Cather and Robert Nathan	377
Nitze, W A, "Or est venuz qui aunera" a Medieval Dictum	405
Ham, E B, An Eighth <i>Vengeance Alexandre</i>	409
Livingston, C H, Old French <i>assiet</i>	414
Hall, R A, Jr, The Silk Factory in Chrestien de Troyes' <i>Yvain</i>	418
Havens, G. R, The Conclusion of Voltaire's <i>Poème sur le désastre de Lisbonne</i>	422
Spitzer, Leo, <i>Binôme</i>	426
Schutz, A H, <i>Auzels Cassadors</i> , V 2334	429
Dahney, L E, The Date of Thillois's <i>Solyman II</i>	431
Pendell, W D, <i>The London Merchant</i> and Le Mierre's <i>Barnevelt</i>	432
Pronger, L J, Marmontel as a Source of Stendahl	433
LeSage, Laurence, The Cliché Basis for Some of the Metaphors of Jean Giraudoux	435
Jessen, M R, Kurzform und Langform bei Adalbert Stifter	439
Kurrelmeyer, W, Ein unbekannter Brief Lenzens an Boie	445
Reichart, W A, Hauptmann's "So lange Gott nimmt, nehm ich auch"	447
Sanderlin, George, The Character "Liberum Arbitrium" in the C-Text of <i>Piers Plowman</i>	449
Krappe, A H, An Oriental Theme in the <i>Friðþjófs Saga</i>	454
Bennett, R E, Puritan	456
Hillmann, M V, <i>Pearl</i> 'Inlyche' and 'Rewarde'	457
Runyan, H J, An Emendation to A. E Housman's Translation from Euripides' <i>Alceste</i> (962-1005)	458
David, Jean, Quelques Aspects démocratiques de la philosophie de Montaigne	485
Hutton, James, Malherbe, Saint-Gelays, Tabourot, Théophile, and the <i>Jardin des Muses</i>	492
Holbrook, Wm C, The Adjective <i>gothique</i> in the XVIIIth Century	498
Remak, H H H, <i>Voltaire à d'Argental</i> (juillet 1759)	504
Wolff, H M, Zur Bedeutung Batteux's fur Lenz	508
Paulsen, Wolfgang, Friedrich Schlegels <i>Alarcos</i> und die Umbildung der Fruehiomantik	513
McKee, D R, Lahontan and Critical Deism	522
Irwin, W R, An Attack on John Fielding	523
Weeter, Dixon, Dr Johnson, Mrs Thrale and Boswell: Three Letters	525
Mizener, Arthur, "Though, Phyllis, Your Prevailing Charms	529
Elmqvist, K E, An Observation on Chaucer's <i>Astrolabe</i>	530
Utey, F L, The Last of the Miller's Head	534
Notopoulos, J. A, Notes on the Text of Shelley's Translations from Plato	536
Schaffer, Aaron, A Breton Romanticist, Mme Auguste Penquer	541
Viens, C P, An Exchange of Notes over George Sand	548
Gordon, Ian A, Three New Letters of Matthew Arnold	552

	PAGE
Barr, M-M H, Bibliographical Data on Voltaire from 1931 to 1940	563
Henkin, L J, The Apocrypha and Chaucer's <i>House of Fame</i>	583
Pitcher, S M, Some Observations on the 1663 Edition of <i>Faustus</i>	588
Gilbert, A H, The Ladder of Lechery, <i>The Faerie Queene</i> , III, 1, 45	594
Pace, G B, Sir Thomas Elyot against Poetry	597
Bartlett, Phyllis Brooks, Chapman and Phaer	599
Allen, D C, Jacques' "Seven Ages" and Pedro Mexia	601
Lynch, J J, Macduff, not Macbeth	603
Webb, H J, The Elizabethan Translation of Vegetius' <i>De Re Militari</i>	605
Mathews, E G, Gil Polo, Desportes, and Lyly's "Cupid and my Campaspe"	606
Mathews, E G, John Donne's "Little Rag"	607
Allen, D C, Donne and the Bezoar	609
Scott-Thomas, H F, Nahum Tate, Laureate Two Biographical Notes	611
Miller, W H, The Authorship of <i>A General View of the Stage</i>	612
Siegel, Paul, "A Paradise within thee" in Milton, Byron, and Shelley	615
Edwards, Herbert, Byron's Return from Greece	618

REVIEWS

Bertha Faust, Hawthorne's Contemporaneous Reputation, R E Blanc, James McHenry (1785-1845), M I J Griffin, Frank R Stockton; M A Bennett, Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, C M Griffin, Henry Blake Fuller [<i>H R Warfel</i>]	67
H. R Patch, On Rereading Chaucer [<i>M B Ruud</i>]	69
C. S Singleton, Nuovi Canti Carnascaleschi del Rinascimento [<i>A. H. Gilbert.</i>]	72
Hugh Macdonald, John Dryden, a Bibliography of Early Editions and of Drydeniana [<i>E N Hooker, H. T Swedenberg, Jr</i>]	74
H W Rosenhaupt, Der deutsche Dichter um die Jahrhundertwende. [<i>F. W. Kaufmann</i>]	75
Cooper, Lane, Aristotelian Papers [<i>W. J Oates.</i>]	77
F. S Boas, Christopher Marlowe [<i>T. M. Parrott.</i>]	141
Baldwin Maxwell, Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger. [<i>J. G. McManaway</i>]	144
H N Fairchild, Religious Trends in English Poetry [<i>R Quintana</i>]	146
William Templeman, The Life and Work of William Gilpin [<i>C. J. Hull</i>]	147
C S Baldwin, Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice, ed. D L Clark [<i>A. H Gilbert.</i>]	149
P A Chapman, The Spirit of Molière [<i>H C. Lancaster</i>]	150
M J Valency, The Tragedies of Herod and Mariamne [<i>H. Ten E Perry</i>]	151
Julius Petersen, Geschichtsdrama und nationaler Mythos. [<i>A. E. Zucker</i>]	152
Franz Bielfeldt, Hebbels Menschengestaltung als dichterischer Ausdruck nordisch-deutschen Wesens. [<i>F W Kaufmann</i>]	153

CONTENTS

vii

PAGE

M D H Norton, Translations from the Poetry of Rainer Maria Rilke, J B Leishman and S Spender (translators), Rainer Maria Rilke. <i>Duino Elegies</i> [E Feise]	155
R M Wilson, Early Middle English Literature [A C Baugh]	218
Margit Sahlín, Etude sur la carole médiévale [Leo Spitzer.]	222
A B Faust (ed), <i>Oberon</i> , translated from the German of Wieland by J Q Adams. [H A Pochmann]	225
Kurt Berger, Jean Paul Der schöpferische Humor. [Eduard Berend.]	228
Ronald Peacock, Holderlin [Victor Lange]	230
Morris Bishop, Ronsard Prince of Poets [W. A. Nitze]	231
F J Crowley, (ed), Voltaire's <i>Poème sur la loi naturelle</i> . [Herbert Dieckmann]	233
E C Wilson, England's Eliza [Kerby Neill.]	234
C B Tinker, Painter and Poet [Robert Shafer]	236
B H Stern, The Rise of Romantic Hellenism in English Literature, 1732-1786 [S A Larrabee]	237
C F Fiske, Epic Suggestion in the Imagery of the Waverley Novels [Stith Thompson]	239
L B Wright (ed), Letters of Robert Carter 1720-1727 [H H Hutcheson]	240
C F Schreiber (ed), Goethe's Works with the exception of <i>Faust</i> , A Catalogue compiled by members of the Yale University staff. [W Kurrelmeyer.]	297
T. A Kirby, Chaucer's <i>Troilus</i> , A Study in Courtly Love [R. K. Root]	300
B. Fay, Civilisation Américaine, I H Herron, The Small Town in American Literature, P Miller, The New England Mind [Herbert Brown]	302
W. A. Kinne, Revivals and Importations of French Comedies in Eng- land, 1749-1800 [E L Avery.]	305
A. M. Ryan, A Map of Old English Monasteries. [F P Magoun]	306
C. van Doen, The American Novel; C. J. Weber, Hardy of Wessex. [J W Beach.]	308
G. R Elliott, Humanism and Imagination. [Robert Shafer.]	309
W S Lewis and W H Smith (eds.), The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence. [R K Root]	310
R. L Sharp, From Donne to Dryden The Revolt Against Meta- physical Poetry [Austin Warren]	312
Léone Rives, Charles Reade, sa vie, ses romans, <i>It's Never Too Late to Mend</i> , an edition [A M. Turner]	313
M R Lowery, Windows of the Morning, a critical study of William Blake's "Poetical Sketches" [M O Percival]	314
L. B Wright, The First Gentlemen of Virginia. [T P. Abernethy]	316
Estelle Kaplan, Philosophy in the Poetry of E A. Robinson. [Eliza- beth Nitchie]	317
J. C. Metcalfe, De Quincey; G. M. Young, The Age of Tennyson; Bernard Groom, On the Diction of Tennyson, Browning and Arnold; E K Chambers, Arnold [H. A Eaton.]	378

	PAGE
A H Nethercot, The Road to Tryermaine [<i>Mario Praz</i>]	381
R Pascal (ed.), Shakespeare in Germany 1750-1815, M Deutschbein, Shakespeares <i>Macbeth</i> als Drama des Barock, P W Biesterfeldt, Die dramatische Technik Thomas Kyds, H Arneke, Kirchengeschichte und Rechtsgeschichte in England [<i>P P Kies</i>]	385
W. Y Tindall, D H Lawrence and Susan His Cow, Cleanth Brooks, Modern Poetry and the Tradition [<i>R P Blackmur</i>]	388
H B Woolf, The Old Germanic Principles of Name Giving [<i>A H Markwardt</i>]	390
J H Hanford, A Milton Handbook, J M French, Milton in Chancery, G W Whiting, Milton's Literary Milieu [<i>W R Parker</i>]	392
W B C Watkins, Perilous Balance The Tragic Genius of Swift, Johnson, and Sterne [<i>F A Pottle</i>]	394
Sister Eugenia Logan, A Concordance to the Poetry of S T Coleridge; P Graham and J. Jones, A Concordance to the Poems of Sidney Lanier [<i>Lane Cooper</i>]	396
Kathryn G Dapp, George Keate, Esq [<i>E W Manwaring</i>]	398
P. F Baum (ed.), Letters of D G Rossetti to Fanny Cornforth [<i>J C Trowell</i>]	399
G E. Jensen, The Life and Letters of H C Bunner [<i>H E Spryey</i>]	400
Amado Alonso, Poesía y Estilo de Pablo Neruda. [<i>P. Salinas</i>]	459
E J Simmons, Dostoevski, the Making of a Novelist [<i>C A Manning</i>]	463
Pierre Trahard, Le Mystère poétique [<i>A. Schinz</i>]	464
Garnet Rees, Remy de Gourmont [<i>B. A. Morrisette</i>]	466
Bertil Malmberg (ed.), <i>Le Roman du Comte de Poitiers</i> . [<i>F Koenig</i>]	469
Austin Warren, Richard Crashaw [<i>H C White</i>]	471
R C Armour and R F Howes, Coleridge the Talker [<i>T M. Raysor</i>]	472
C K Bang, Maske und Gesicht in den Werken C F. Meyers [<i>F W Kaufmann.</i>]	473
W Krogmann (ed.), <i>Das Redentiner Osterspiel</i> [<i>A E Zucker</i>]	474
C. I Silin, Benserade and His <i>Ballets de Cour</i> [<i>Colbert Searles</i>]	555
F W Kaufmann, German Dramatists of the 19th Century [<i>Wolfgang Paulsen</i>]	557
G. S. Haight, George Eliot and John Chapman [<i>Anna T Kitchel</i>]	559
R. Fricker, Das Historische Drama in England; H Frenz, Die Entwicklung des sozialen Dramas in England; H B Charlton, <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> as an Experimental Tragedy; H D. Rix, Rhetoric in Spenser's Poetry, J L Shanley, A Study of Spenser's Gentleman, M B. Smith, Marlowe's Imagery, T. Rich, Harington & Ariosto, L U. Lucken, <i>Antichrist</i> in the Chester Cycle; H Buchan, The Poems of Thomas Pestell, R B. Daniels, Some Seventeenth-Century Worthies, E J Howard (ed.), Sir Thomas Elyot's <i>The Defence of Good Women</i> ; B COLES, Shakespeare Studies. <i>Julius Caesar</i> . [<i>H N. Hillebrand.</i>]	620
W. W Greg, The Variants in the First Quarto of <i>King Lear</i> [<i>L Kurschbaum</i>]	624
M. A. Rugoff, Donne's Imagery [<i>G Williamson</i>]	626

CONTENTS

ix

PAGE

L Bradner, <i>Musae Anglicanae</i> , W Ringler (ed), W Allen, Jr (trans), J Ramolds, <i>Oratio in Laudem Artis Poeticae</i> ; V B Heltzel and H H Hudson (eds and trans), T Moffet, <i>Nobilis and Lessus Lugubris</i> [D C Allen]	628
C L Day and E B Murrie, <i>English Song-Books, 1651-1702 a Bibli- ography</i> [J G McManaway]	630
C J Sisson, <i>The Judicious Marriage of Mr Hooker and the Birth of The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity</i> [M. Y Hughes].	631
C B Tinker and H F Lowry, <i>The Poetry of Matthew Arnold</i> [C F Harrold]	633

BRIEF MENTION

F Brie, <i>Die nationale Literatur Schottlands von den Anfängen bis zur Renaissance</i> [K Malone]	78
J. Holmes, <i>The Poet's Work</i> [L Teeter]	79
J K Piercy, <i>Studies in Literary Types in 17th Century America (1607-1710)</i> . [L Howard]	79
K E Gilbert and H Kuhn, <i>A History of Esthetics</i> [G Boas]	79
S I Hayakawa, H M Jones, and H H Clark (eds), <i>Oliver Wendell Holmes Representative Selections</i> [M A De Wolfe Howe]	156
C. P Higby and B T Schantz (eds), <i>John Lothrop Motley Repre- sentative Selections</i> [M A De Wolfe Howe]	156
C Karstien, <i>Historische deutsche Grammatik, 1 Band: Geschichtliche Einleitung, Lautlehre</i> [E. H Sehrt]	157
M Nicolson (ed.), <i>Captain Samuel Bunt, A Voyage to Cacklogallmia</i> [W A. Eddy]	158
H W Garrod, <i>Keats</i> [N S Bushnell]	159
J. S Nelson (tr), <i>Aeneas Silvii de Liberos Educatione</i> [A H Gilbert]	160
A Weihe, <i>Der junge Eichendorff und Novalis' Naturpantheismus</i> . [E Feise]	161
K. A McEuen, <i>Classical Influence upon the Tribe of Ben</i> [D C Allen]	241
M C Boyd, <i>Elizabethan Music and Musical Criticism</i> . [L. Bradner]	242
T P Harrison, Jr (ed) and H J Leon (tr), <i>The Pastoral Elegy An Anthology</i> [M Parmenter]	242
R. T Sherwin, <i>The Viking and the Red Man, the Old Norse Origin of the Algonquin Language</i> . [S Einarsson.]	243
D Worcester, <i>The Art of Satire</i> [O J. Campbell]	318
J Mersand, <i>Traditions in American Literature</i> [N B Fagin]	319
R L Hawkins, <i>Positivism in the United States (1853-1861)</i> [R Shafer]	320
M. E Clark, <i>Peter Porcupine in America</i> . [T Hornberger]	320
H M and N K Chadwick, <i>The Growth of Literature</i> [K. Malone.]	401
M P Koch, <i>An Analysis of the Long Prayers in Old French Literature</i> . [L Spitzer.]	402

	PAGE
B H Clark (ed.), America's Lost Plays [H Spencer]	475
W Tolles, Tom Taylor and the Victorian Drama. [H Spencer]	476
G Boas (ed.), Romanticism in America [H M Jones]	477
A Quiller-Couch (ed.), The New Oxford Book of English Verse [C Brooks]	478
D C Bryant, Edmund Burke and his Literary Friends [B R McElderry, Jr.]	479
F L Lucas, Ten Victorian Poets [L W Miles]	479
E Baldauf, Die Syntax des Komparativs im Gotischen, Althochdeutschen, und Altsächsischen [A W Potterfield]	480
W A Nitze, Arthurian Romance and Modern Poetry and Music [A C L Brown]	481
I T Whitfield, Louisiana French Folk Songs [J K Ditchy]	481
S Painter, French Chivalry. [T A Kirby]	482
S B Ewing, Burtonian Melancholy in the Plays of John Ford [H Spencer]	482
A J Armstrong (ed.), Letters of Nicholas Vachel Lindsay to A J Armstrong [H Spencer]	483
A H Gilbert, Literary Criticism, Plato to Dryden [G Boas.]	560
J. W. Harris, John Bale [H Spencer]	561
A Harbage, Annals of English Drama, 975-1700 [H Spencer]	561
F O Nolte, Lessing's <i>Laokoon</i> [H M Wolff]	635
H Eigerman (ed.), The Poetry of Dorothy Wordsworth Edited from the <i>Journals</i> [L Cooper]	636
W E Gilman, Milton's Rhetoric [W Haller]	636
E H O'Neill, Biography by Americans [B. Mayo]	637
J. Power, Shelley in America in the 19th Century [N I White]	638
E Nitchie, The Reverend Colonel Finch [F L Jones]	638
G C D Odell, Annals of the New York Stage [N B Fagin]	639
B H Clark (ed.), America's Lost Plays [H Spencer]	639

CORRESPONDENCE

J. S. P. Tatlock, Is Chaucer's Monk a Monk?	80
R. Bressie, Chaucer's Monk Again	161
L. Spitzer, <i>Scorsone</i> , 'salsifs noir'	243
H J Weigand, A "Falsified Verse" in Kleist's <i>Homburg</i> ?	321
B M Woodbridge, Rousseau and <i>Faust</i>	324
The Editors, <i>The Review of English Studies</i>	324
L. Spitzer, <i>Locomotive et automobile</i>	403
E H Sehrt, <i>Urfaust</i> , line 308	483
R. Dunlap, Some Unpublished Verses by Thomas Randolph	484
M. Summers, The Gothic Quest	501
M. Summers, Aphra Behn and Montfleury	562
The Editors, Société genevoise de linguistique	640
The Editors, Maupassant	640

Modern Language Notes

Volume LVI

JANUARY, 1941

Number 1

TOBIAS SMOLLETT AND THE *UNIVERSAL HISTORY*

Among the multifarious interests of Tobias Smollett, his connection with that massive compilation, *The Modern Part of the Universal History*,¹ remains one of the most puzzling and obscure. Numerous references to Smollett's work upon this project occur in his correspondence, but these, though sufficient to establish a link, provide only the barest hints at the extent of his labors. In order to determine adequately his part in the compilation, it is essential to supplement these allusions with more specific data.

Such additional evidence may be found in three sources. (1) From 1759 until 1765 the *Critical Review* published thirty-seven articles dealing with the various volumes of *The Modern Part of the Universal History* as the octavo edition gradually appeared. At least a dozen of these reviews appear to have been written by Smollett,² and therefore provide fertile suggestions as to his part in the work. (2) During the same period Smollett reviewed many other historical and geographical publications for the *Critical*, and in some of these articles he reveals information which, it seems, he could only have derived from his work on the *Universal History*. (3) From 1761 until 1769 appeared the translation of Voltaire's *Works* for which Smollett himself states that he wrote "all the

¹ Forty-four vols., octavo, London, 1759-66, 16 vols., folio, London, 1759-65. The whole project began to appear in sheets in 1730 under the title, *An Universal History from the Earliest Account of Time to the Present*, but when the section on ancient history was at last completed in 1744, in seven great folio volumes, it was deemed wise to divide the work into two parts, "Ancient" and "Modern," and allow time for compilers and readers to recuperate.

² The attribution to Smollett sometimes depends on links between these reviews, as well as on the other evidence of his connection with various parts of the *Universal History*, it has therefore seemed wise to treat the authorship of most of these articles in the Addenda.

notes historical and critical"³ Since many of these notes are either copied or remembered from the *Universal History*, they help to indicate the portions of the compilation with which Smollett was particularly familiar.

First, it is necessary to establish Smollett's connection with the work from various remarks in his correspondence. On April 4, 1759 he wrote to Samuel Richardson, one of the publishers of the history, and demanded to know why the proprietor had sent him "eight printed sheets of the Modern History"⁴ William Richardson, Samuel's nephew, replied with this explanation:

The four slips sent you of vol xv beginning with the history of the Hottentots, were written by Mr Shirley, who is also the author of the other four sent you of the xvi volume, beginning with the history of Ansiko My uncle is apprehensive, that the whole eight sheets must be re-printed, because of the barrenness both of style and compilation My uncle was to convey to you all that was written by Mr Shirley, that your opinion might be obtained of that gentleman's part, before it came to be laid before the public⁵

Since these eight sheets of the *Universal History* form separate sections of the account of southern and western Africa,⁶ it is reasonable to assume that this entire account had been assigned to Shirley, and that therefore Smollett was forced to peruse the 461 folio pages which comprise this suspect history. We do not know, of course, how much more of the whole compilation Shirley may have written. The fact that Smollett was asked to exercise supreme judgment over such a huge mass of material prepared by another compiler is

³ Edward S. Noyes, *The Letters of Tobias Smollett* (Cambridge, [Mass.], 1926), p. 82. Since Smollett made this statement on May 8, 1763, he may have intended it to apply only to the volumes which had thus far appeared, but he makes no such qualification. Mr. Joliat ("Smollett, Editor of Voltaire," *MLN*, LVI, 429-436) shows that he edited only the prose, which evoked all notes used here.

⁴ *Letters*, p. 59.

⁵ *The Miscellaneous Works of Tobias Smollett* (Edinburgh, 1820), I, 176. Richardson refers to the octavo edition, in the following study I refer to the folio edition exclusively.

⁶ *Univ. Hist.*, VI, 383-98, 572-87 (approximately). Between these two sections comes the description of Kongo, Angola, and nearby countries. On p. 574 begins the history of Guinea, the opening portion of which must have been included in the second section of four sheets sent to Smollett. The description of Guinea, together with the accounts of Sierra Leona and the interior countries, covers VI, 574-724, and VII, 1-120.

sufficient to prove that in this project he was regarded not as a booksellers' drudge, but as an editor of distinguished ability.

The scope of Smollett's editorial powers is further elucidated by later remarks in this exchange of letters. Smollett has declared that he can do nothing with Shirley's copy,

. until I shall have completed the chasm upon which I am at work; and now I talk of that chasm, I cannot help repeating my complaint, that Dr Campbell should have left the task to me, of filling up a chasm of fifteen or sixteen sheets, with a description of a country which all the art of man cannot spin out to half the number I have before me all that ever was written on the subject, and find the task altogether impossible, unless we throw into this place the discovery and description of the Straits of Magellan, Terra del Fuego, the Straits of Le Maire, Cape Horn, and an account of the voyages of some Navigators who have sailed round it into the South Sea I do not see any impropriety in this expedient, as the subject naturally belongs to, or at least has an affinity with, that of the countries situated towards the Anntartic circle, and South Pole ⁷

To this suggestion William Richardson again replies with words which reveal the utmost faith in Smollett's capacity:

Mr Millar approves likewise of your scheme, and joins my uncle in requesting you to proceed with the gap in the proposed, or in any other manner that shall seem best to you for the service of the work ⁸

It is clear from the above reference to Dr. John Campbell, one of the principal authors of, the "Ancient Part" of the *Universal History*, that Smollett by no means had complete authority over the whole work; but every line of Richardson's letter is stamped with a tone of deference which leaves no doubt that Smollett's position was no less than that of a co-editor.

Accordingly, much of Smollett's labor doubtless consisted in revision of copy submitted by understrappers, a task which he himself describes in the following letter to Samuel Richardson:

You will receive, with this, the last part of the copy for France which was in my possession, and which brings the history no farther down than the year 1656, in the minority of Louis XIV. . You will see, that, in this parcel, I have expunged many needless notes, abridged the text in divers places, and written side-notes where they were wanting, and all this with the great toil and hazard of my eyes. . . The great bulk of this copy arises, not from a great multiplicity of incidents and variety of matter, but from a certain spunginess of expression ⁹

⁷ *Letters*, pp 59-60.

⁸ *Works* (Edinb, 1820), I, 176

⁹ *Letters*, p. 66.

It is clear from Smollett's mention of his "great toil" and the "great bulk" of the copy, that the "parcel" concerned must have comprised a sizable portion of the history of France. Furthermore, he says that this is only "the last part of the copy for France which was in my possession" though the phraseology here is somewhat ambiguous, one may fairly assume that he had also been editorially responsible for some earlier parts of this history, which, as far as 1656, includes 541 folio pages¹⁰ At any rate, it is evident that he performed his editorial duties with the greatest exactitude and integrity.

But Smollett's functions were by no means merely editorial, for he tells us explicitly that he wrote a "small part"¹¹ of the history, and in a publication of forty-four thick octavo volumes a "small part" may be very extensive. It is significant, therefore, that on April 20, 1759 he is thus forced to decline an invitation from Wilkes

But, for the present, I am obliged to enjoy these Pleasures in Speculation only, & even this feast of Imagination am I fain to snatch as a momentary Respite from reading dull books & writing dull Commentaries *invita Minerva*.¹²

With the same tone of utter fatigue he writes to a friend in Jamaica nine months later:

If I go on writing as I have proceeded for some years, my hand will be paralytic, and my brain dried to a snuff. I would not wish my greatest enemy a greater curse than the occupation of an author, in which capacity I have toiled myself into an habitual asthma.¹³

Since Smollett had finished the revision of his *History of England* by September 28, 1758 and the sheets of the *Continuation* did not begin to appear until May 17, 1760,¹⁴ it seems that the only publication which could have required such painful labor during the year 1759 must have been the *Universal History*; surely his incidental work on the *Critical Review* and *Sir Launcelot Greaves* could not have been so exacting.¹⁵ Furthermore, in a letter of

¹⁰ *Univ. Hist.*, VIII, 617-716; IX, 1-442.

¹¹ *Letters*, p. 82.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 60-1.

¹³ *RES*, XII, 76-7.

¹⁴ See *Letters*, p. 54; *Lloyd's Evening Post*, May 21-23, 1760.

¹⁵ Smollett's supervision of the articles printed in the *Critical Review*

October 12, 1760, directly concerned with the *Universal History*, he implies a vast amount of personal labor on the compilation :

Other tradesmen can acquire wealth, by employing a number of good hands under their immediate direction, but an author of genius and reputation must, it seems, be a journeyman for life, and be obliged to subsist by the labour of his own hands.¹⁶

It is important, then, to ascertain which portions of the *Universal History* he may have written, for imbedded in this colossal work may lie original compositions by Smollett which equal or surpass in scope and quality his famous *History of England*.

Clear evidence of personal compilation by Smollett is found in his above mention of the "chasm" assigned to him. The portion here concerned is the "History of the Southern Continent," that largely hypothetical land (pieced together from fragmentary reports), which, as the *Universal History* explains, "lies beyond the three southern points of the known world; that is, beyond the *Cape of Good Hope*, the *Moluccas* and *Celebes*, and the *Streights of Magellan*"¹⁷—obviously the region which Smollett refers to in the above letter as "the countries situated towards the Antarctic circle, and South Pole." He has filled the "chasm" in the manner proposed, by relating in detail the voyages of various circum-navigators and other adventurers into the "South Sea." Here, therefore, is one long section of 134 large folio pages¹⁸ (each page

seems not to have been rigorous, for he declares that he never saw his magazine's remarks on *Douglas* (March, 1757) "until they were in print" (*Letters*, p. 51). Indeed, by 1758 his connection with the magazine had apparently become very loose on January 2 of that year he says, "I have for some time done very little in the Critical Review" (*ibid*); and nine months later he repeats, "I have not had leisure to do much in that work for some time past" (*ibid*, p. 55). *Sir Launcelot Greaves* appeared serially in the *British Magazine*, January, 1760-December, 1761, the whole novel could not have been completed when it began to appear, for the prison-sequence (Chaps. xx-xxi), which was published in July and August, 1761, is generally accepted as the result of Smollett's own observations during his confinement in the King's Bench prison, November, 1760-February, 1761. Scott, indeed, declares that some installments of the novel, "when post-time drew near," were hastily prepared within "half an hour or an hour" ("Prefatory Memoir to Smollett," in *Ballantyne's Novelists's Library*, II, xxiii)

¹⁶ *Letters*, p. 68

¹⁷ *Univ Hist*, v, 2.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, v, 1-134. The account of the "Southern Continent" really ends at page 47, and the rest is concerned chiefly with the voyages of various

containing about one thousand words) for which Smollett was personally responsible, although he probably had some assistance in condensing the accounts of voyages

A more important section is the huge "History of the German Empire," 485 folio pages in length,¹⁹ which Smollett evidently wrote in entirety. On March 1, 1754 he declares, "I have likewise made some progress in the 'History of the German Empire,' which I believe will be printed this ensuing summer."²⁰ Although the corresponding portion of the *Universal History* was not published until 1761, we know that work on the "Modern Part" had begun as early as December 12, 1751²¹ and that the project suffered unexpected and protracted delays.²² Since no such history of Germany appears to have been published separately, Smollett's statement may be taken as evidence that he was engaged with the *Universal History* at a much earlier date than has hitherto been supposed. For there can be no doubt that the "History of the German Empire" in the compilation is Smollett's: (1) In his edition of Voltaire the portions which deal with Germany are studded with footnotes which Smollett has derived from this part of the *Universal History*, these are so detailed and show such intimate knowledge of sources that they could only have been made by one immersed in the study of German history.²³ (2) In an article which Smollett undoubtedly wrote for the *Critical Review*²⁴ he shows great familiarity with Barre and Heiss, two of the chief authorities for the account of Germany in the *Universal History*. (3) In a letter to the proprietors of the compilation Smollett

circumnavigators, but the whole section bears the running-title, "A history of the Southern Continent." Smollett complains of "a chasm of fifteen or sixteen sheets," or a maximum of 64 folio pages, apparently the accounts of voyagers stretched the section beyond its allotted length.

¹⁹ *Univ. Hist.*, x, [617]-718; xi, [1]-384

²⁰ *Letters*, pp. 28-9.

²¹ See Richardson, *Correspondence*, ed. Barbauld (London, 1804), ii, 279

²² See *Cr. Rev.*, vii, 1.

²³ See, for example, Voltaire's *Works*, iv, 2-3, xx, 174, 210, xxi, 40, 48, 67, 103-4, 233, cf., respectively, *Univ. Hist.*, xi, 128-31, x, 650, 668, xi, 4, 8, 24, 48, 137.

²⁴ *Cr. Rev.*, vii, 337-56 (Apr., 1759) Smollett's authorship is established by the style, the knowledge of English history (pp. 341-3), the defense of the Scots (pp. 340-1), the remarks on language (p. 344), and various satirical thrusts. For familiarity with Barre and Heiss see pp. 340, 344

particularly recommends for publication "the copy which has been delivered of the German empire, the kingdoms of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden; all of which were compiled chiefly from authors who never appeared in the English language"²⁵ Since, as we shall see, the histories of the last three countries were evidently written by Smollett himself, it is safe to assume that personal compilation is responsible for his interest in all these unpublished accounts and his familiarity with their sources.

The account of Germany, then, is Smollett's, and, just as certainly, the account of Sweden is his. In a letter of February 4, 1760 he requests books for the history of Sweden,²⁶ and three months later declares, "In writing the history of Sweden, we"²⁷ are at a great loss, and indeed a full stop, for want of the *Histoire General de Swede*. . . ."²⁸ A month later he writes, "As the authors who treat of Sweden, cannot be procured, I must either lay the work aside, or proceed to another subject."²⁹ Despite these hindrances, however, the history had obviously been finished by October 12, 1760, when Smollett sent the above recommendation to the proprietors.

Aside from the above link with the histories of Germany and Sweden, there is ample evidence to show that the account of Denmark (which includes that of Norway) is also the work of Smollett himself. The history of Sweden contains so many allusions to details related in "our history of Denmark" and shows such intimate knowledge of the conflicting accounts of "the Danish writers," that one must, it seems, attribute both histories to the same author. Moreover, a month after Smollett recommended both histories to the publishers, there appeared in the *Critical Review* an appraisal of Raymond's *History of Gustavus Ericson*³⁰ which is remarkably Smollettian in style and reflections and which shows a detailed knowledge of the seven historians who constitute the chief

²⁵ *Works* (Edinb., 1820), I, 179.

²⁶ *Letters*, p 65

²⁷ The "we" refers to Smollett and his amanuensis, as the next letter shows (see below, p 9).

²⁸ *Letters*, p 66

²⁹ *Ibid*, p 67

³⁰ *Cr. Rev*, x, 372-85 (Nov. 1760) For familiarity with Danish and Swedish historians see pp. 373-4, where the reviewer refutes a passage by Raymond, in accordance with facts and sources given in *Univ. Hist*, XII, 235-6.

sources for the accounts of Denmark and Sweden in the *Universal History*. The coincidence is too great to be attributed to chance: one must conclude that this review is further proof of Smollett's personal labors on these two histories, especially since this article is cited later by the *Critical* in a review undoubtedly by Smollett,³¹ who, here appraising the *Universal History's* account of Sweden, shows the same minute acquaintance with the sources of both Danish and Swedish history. The latter review, indeed, can only be interpreted as an exposition of Smollett's own problems and policies in compiling the two histories. There can be little doubt, then, that the accounts of Denmark and Sweden, comprising 488 large folio pages,³² are largely the work of Smollett himself.

In this connection it is suggestive to consider also the review of Busching's *Geography* which Smollett wrote for the *Critical* in October, 1761,³³ a month after the review just mentioned. Here Smollett not only shows again his knowledge of Swedish and Danish history, but adds an amazing list of authorities for "the northern kingdoms" in general whom Busching has neglected:

Rudbeck's *Atalantica*, Olaus Magnus, Witfeld, Pontani Chorographia Scandinaviae, annexed to his history, Florus Danicus, Aeneas Sylvius, Guaguini [sic], Erasmus Stella, Martin Ciomer, Mathew of Michovia, Hartmannus Schedelius, and a variety of other political and chorographical writers, collected by Pistorius, all of which would have proved extremely useful³⁴

Since Smollett seems well acquainted with the contents of these books, it is a fair conjecture that he may have used them in preparing the *Universal History*, but his information could not have

³¹ *Cr. Rev.*, XII, 321-35 (Nov, 1761). For evidence of Smollett's authorship see Addenda, for citation of review of Raymond see p. 328.

³² *Univ. Hist.*, XI, [649]-713, XII, [1]-205 (Denmark); XII, [206]-424 (Sweden).

³³ *Cr. Rev.*, XII, 237-50. Smollett's authorship is indicated by the following evidence: the long introductory disquisition on the importance of geographical knowledge sounds Smollettian in style and reflections; the denunciation of booksellers (p. 238) is similar to remarks made a year earlier by Smollett in a letter to Richardson (see *Letters*, p. 68); the reviewer (p. 244) echoes the discussion of the ancient strength of Denmark which appeared in *C. R.*, XII, 163, in a review undoubtedly by Smollett (see Addenda); the reviewer (pp. 243-4) refutes an opinion of Busching by supporting a theory advanced in Smollett's history of Denmark (see *Univ. Hist.*, XI, [649]).

³⁴ *Cr. Rev.*, XII, 243.

been gained entirely from compiling the histories of Denmark and Sweden, for several of the above authors are not cited in these accounts. On the other hand, Cromer, Guagnini, and Mathew of Michovia are chief sources for the account of Poland in the *Universal History*, while Stella is cited under the accounts of Lithuania and Prussia. The histories of the last three countries immediately follow the accounts of Denmark and Sweden in the *Universal History*, a knowledge of the nature of the sources for the histories of Lithuania and Prussia is suggested in a review of this section which Smollett may have written for the *Critical* in February, 1762,³⁵ and, finally, Busching's *Geography* is first used as a source for the *Universal History* in the account of Poland—a circumstance which may explain how Smollett came to notice Busching's omissions. There is a strong probability, then, that Smollett was also responsible for this section on Poland, Lithuania, and Prussia, 232 folio pages in length.³⁶

During the delay in writing the history of Sweden Smollett writes to Samuel Richardson, "I have pitched upon Holland, and inclosed a list of books, which I beg may be sent with all expedition, as both I and my amanuensis are idle."³⁷ This intimation of personal responsibility is reinforced by the review of the *Universal History*'s account of the United Provinces which appeared in the *Critical*.³⁸ This article, written in Smollett's style, shows a familiarity with the nature of the sources for Dutch history which must be based on actual work with these materials: of the thirteen authorities here mentioned by name, at least nine were used for the account of Holland in the *Universal History*, and the two which the reviewer discusses at length, Bentivoglio and Grotius, were chief sources for this account. Here again the coincidence is too great to be dismissed as chance, there should be no difficulty in regarding this review as evidence that Smollett did compile the "History of the United Provinces," 263 folio pages in length.³⁹

One more history remains for discussion. In the anonymous life of Smollett published in the *Annual Register* for 1775, the writer

³⁵ *Cr. Rev.*, XIII, 107-20. See Addenda for evidence of Smollett's hand.

³⁶ *Univ. Hist.*, XII, [425]-657.

³⁷ *Letters*, p. 67.

³⁸ *Cr. Rev.*, XII, 81-103 (Aug., 1761). For familiarity with sources of Dutch history see pp. 81-2, 88.

³⁹ *Univ. Hist.*, XI, [385]-648.

declares that Smollett wrote a "great part" of the *Universal History*, "particularly the Histories of France, Italy, and Germany."⁴⁰ This hint concerning the account of Italy, it seems, should not be disregarded, for the author is correct as to the history of Germany, and partly right in regard to Smollett's connection with the history of France, some of which we know he revised, although he evidently did not compile it. A mass of other evidence supports the anonymous biographer: (1) In the recommendation to the publishers already mentioned Smollett declares:

I am persuaded that the histories of Mahomet, of the coast of Guinea, of the Popes,⁴¹ and many others, published as parts of the *Universal History*, might, with the help of new title pages, become separate books of current sale.⁴²

We have already, in the same letter, seen Smollett recommending unpublished copy which he himself has written, and therefore we may justly have a strong suspicion that he also had some connection with the three histories cited above, at least, it is certain that part of the account of Guinea was handed to Smollett for criticism. (2) In the review of Bower's *History of the Popes* which Smollett states that he wrote for the *Critical*,⁴³ he shows great familiarity with Baronius, Platina, and the *History of the Popes* attributed to Bruys, all which are used as sources for the account of Italy in the *Universal History*. In particular, in this review Smollett makes a correction of Bruys which accords with the details as given in the *Universal History*.⁴⁴ (3) In his review of the *Universal History's* account of Denmark⁴⁵ Smollett shows full knowledge of the reasons for not completing the section on Italy, and in a review of the account of Italy itself,⁴⁶ the writer, apparently Smollett, shows an intimate acquaintance with the difficulties attending the composition of the history of the Popes. (4) In the footnotes to this account of Italy occur many allusions to Smollett's "History of

⁴⁰ *Annual Register*, xviii, 48 (second pagination)

⁴¹ All but the first forty-eight pages of the "History of Italy" are included under the sub-title, "The History of the Popes"

⁴² *Works* (Edinb, 1820), i, 179

⁴³ *Cr. Rev*, xi, 217-33 (Mar, 1761), see *Letters*, p 70

⁴⁴ See *Cr Rev*, xi, 217, cf *Univ Hist*, ix, 525

⁴⁵ *Cr Rev*, xii, 161-78 (Sept, 1761). See Addenda for evidence of Smollett's authorship

⁴⁶ *Ibid*, xi, 81-91 (Feb, 1761) See Addenda for evidence of Smollett's authorship.

the German Empire" which must have been made by someone very familiar with the contents of the latter. It seems, then, that Smollett probably wrote or at least edited the "History of Italy," 375 folio pages in length.⁴⁷

Finally, the connection of so many accounts with Smollett is strengthened by the fact that most of them occur successively in the *Universal History* and deal with countries which form a compact geographical unit. Immediately after the history of France comes the history of Italy (the Popes), then, after intervening accounts of Venice, Naples, and Genoa, come the histories of the German Empire, the United Provinces (Holland), Denmark (including Norway), Sweden, Poland, Lithuania, and Prussia. It seems that the section on these contiguous European states comprised Smollett's chief contribution to the compilation.⁴⁸

The following conclusions thus emerge (1) Smollett read and possibly corrected some part of, if not all the account of southern and western Africa, which extends to 461 folio pages, (2) he corrected a large part of the history of France immediately preceding 1656, and seems to have been editorially responsible for earlier portions of this history, which, down to 1656, comprises a total of 541 folio pages; (3) he possibly compiled or at least had a close connection with the histories of Italy, Poland, Lithuania, and Prussia, a total of 607 folio pages; (4) he certainly compiled the histories of the German Empire, the United Provinces, Denmark, Sweden, and the Southern Continent, a total of 1370 folio pages. It is obviously impossible to declare that he did not have some assistance in preparing the last group of histories. All the evidence, however, tends to indicate that for these portions he employed, at most, only an "amanuensis," who may have performed some preliminary work of translation or condensation, but who could hardly be considered as an author of the finished histories. Accordingly, it appears that either through editorial supervision or personal compilation Smollett was responsible for nearly 3000 folio pages (almost a third of the work) and as a result edited or compiled a total of about three million words—and doubtless he also worked

⁴⁷ *Univ Hist*, ix, 515-717; x, [1]-173

⁴⁸ There is no reason to connect Smollett with the histories of Venice, Naples, and Genoa, except the fact that they do thus occur in the midst of the other histories with which his connection has been established.

upon other portions with which his specific relation cannot be established.⁴⁹ Such was his "small part" of the *Universal History*!

LOUIS L. MARTZ

Yale University

ADDENDA

Reviews of *The Modern Part of the Universal History* attributed to Smollett (All the following reviews, except the last, contain extensive introductory disquisitions which, by their knowledge, reflections, and style, would alone suggest the possibility of Smollett's authorship to one acquainted with his works Obviously, however, the presentation of an adequate number of parallel phrases, structures, and ideas from Smollett's known works would extend this study beyond all reasonable length. Accordingly, in some places I have been forced to state merely a personal impression of these introductions, but, except for the first review, only when the authorship is supported by other evidence In all the following reviews, the prose style seems Smollettian, though here again, this is never the only evidence)

Critical Review, VII, 1-14 (Jan., 1759) Mohammed and the Arabs This, the review of the first three volumes, opens with a long laudation of the whole undertaking which is clearly written by one acquainted with the difficulty of preparing the compilation and especially interested in its success, there seems little doubt that this is Smollett's own advertisement for his project.

VIII, 189-99 (Sept., 1759): Japan and East Indies. A long introductory section develops a comparison and contrast between Great Britain and Japan, and between France and China, with some satirical thrusts this undoubtedly represents the germ of Smollett's *Adventures of an Atom*, which seems to owe much of its framework to this very account of Japan (This aspect of the *Adventures of an Atom* is, however, too complex to be treated here, and must therefore be reserved for another discussion) A long quotation (pp 191-3), dealing with an odd surgical operation, may point to Dr Smollett's peculiar interests Smollett has read this section of the history with considerable care, for he echoes it in a note to Voltaire's *Works*, VI, 154 (cf *Univ Hist*, IV, 8, 12-13, 16).

IX, 161-77 (Mar., 1760) Africa The reviewer, in his introductory

⁴⁹ One additional section with which Smollett may have been concerned is the "History of the Othmân Empire" (*Univ Hist*, V, 135-478) Some of Smollett's notes to his edition of Voltaire show an acquaintance with the sources of this history which could hardly have been derived from casual reading, and it does not appear that he reviewed this section for the *Critical* Furthermore, this history immediately follows the account of the Southern Continent—the "chasm" upon which we know that Smollett worked. (See Voltaire's *Works*, III, 82, 87, VI, 96, XXI, 178-9, cf, respectively, *Univ. Hist.*, V, 172-4, 172, 367, 207.)

paragraph, shows a detailed knowledge of the plan for future volumes of the *Universal History* which could not have been derived from the volume in hand. The antiquarian and linguistic interests (pp 162-3), the general acquaintance with travel-books, and the scorn of "religious enthusiasts" (p 170) all point toward Smollett.

x, 81-90 (Aug, 1760) Spain. The review opens with a long dissertation on history in general, in which the comparison with the learning of Sweden and Denmark, the knowledge of the Spanish language, and the reflections on Italian, Spanish, French, and English historians all suggest Smollett. The writer seems to be the same as in the next review, which is indubitably Smollett's.

x, 161-78 (Sept, 1760): Spain and Portugal. The review opens with a long dissertation which defends the position of the Critical Reviewer, summarizes his difficulties, and states the policy of the magazine in general. The reviewer (p 165) shows knowledge of materials to be included in the unpublished accounts of the German Empire and Holland, which we know Smollett compiled, in particular, the refutation of some statements concerning Charles V (p 165) may indicate information learned by Smollett in writing the account of Germany. The reviewer (pp 167-8) singles out the death of Don Carlos for particular, lengthy discussion. The same facts (taken from *Univ Hist*, VIII, 259-61) are repeated in two of Smollett's notes to Voltaire's *Works* (III, 13-14, V, 10-11), Smollett's acquaintance with this history of Spain is proved by his use of it in several other notes to Voltaire.

XI, 5-18 (Jan, 1761) France and Italy. The reviewer singles out "the number of authorities quoted in the relation of Mazarine's ministry, and the minority of Lewis" as being "almost incredible" (pp 5-6) this is the exact portion of the history of France which we know Smollett edited. The introductory paragraph shows an acquaintance with the nature of the sources for the period of Louis XIV, which may well be the result of Smollett's editorial work on this particular part of the *Universal History*.

XI, 81-91 (Feb, 1761) Italy. The long introductory vilification of papal tyranny suggests Smollett. The concluding paragraph shows a knowledge of the "general design of the writers" and the difficulties which beset them in compiling this section, with which Smollett has been connected, the reviewer could hardly have derived this knowledge from the volume in hand.

XII, 18-103 (Aug., 1761) United Provinces. See above, p 9, for evidence of Smollett's authorship.

XII, 161-78 (Sept, 1761) Denmark. The two-page introduction presents a spirited defense of the whole *Universal History* in which the reviewer shows a full understanding of the reasons for not completing the account of the Italian states and is aware of the plan to provide a "copious index" for the entire work, this is obviously not an ordinary reviewer speaking, but a special pleader who is vitally interested in the success of the project; the tone leaves little doubt that this is Smollett's attempt to revive interest in the history.

XII, 321-35 (Nov, 1761) Sweden. The reviewer is the same as in the

preceding article (see pp. 321-2, 325) In a long introduction he shows a detailed knowledge of the sources of Danish and Swedish history which could only have been derived from actual work with these authorities (see also pp 324-5), he even explains the policy of "our historians" in treating contradictory sources (pp 321-2), he notes a few minor errata (pp 322-3), chiefly typographical, some of which are so minute that it is impossible to believe that an ordinary reviewer would have noticed them, there can be little doubt that the above remarks are the result of Smollett's own work with the histories of Denmark and Sweden

XIII, 107-20 (Feb, 1762) Poland, Lithuania, and Prussia A long introductory dissertation on the causes of differences between nations suggests Smollett, the reviewer refers (p 113) to "a similar story in the Danish annals", he shows some knowledge of the nature of the sources for the histories of Lithuania and Prussia (p 120), with which Smollett has been somewhat tenuously connected

XIII, 381-92 (May, 1762) Russia The reviewer (pp 382-3, 384, 386) reprimands the historians for plagiarizing Voltaire and Busching, and cites passages of the history of Russia which have been transcribed verbatim from these authors, it is difficult to see how a reviewer could have detected this debt unless he had recently been reading these sources with considerable care Smollett was at this very time engaged in the translation of Voltaire's *Works*, which included the "History of the Russian Empire under Peter the Great", and he had, seven months before, reviewed the first volume of Busching's *Geography*, which contains the account of Russia

It is amusing to notice that in at least six of the above articles Smollett seems to have reviewed sections of the history which he either edited or compiled; in treating other parts the *Critical Review* is frequently caustic in regard to the style and bulk of the work, but in reviews of sections which Smollett apparently compiled the tone is nearly always one of unqualified enthusiasm.

GERMAN LEXICOGRAPHY

PART VII

The material for the present article comes from the works of Johann Jacobi von Wallhausen. The dates of his birth and of his death are unrecorded; the few known facts of his life are derived from his books: he learned the art of war in the Netherlands, and must have been a soldier of long experience when he wrote his works, published in the first quarter of the seventeenth century All of these works are now extremely rare. the *Quellen-Verzeichnis zum Deutschen Worterbuch*, Gottingen 1910, cites only the *Manuale militare, oder Kriegß-manual*, Frankfurt 1616,

whereas the *Worterbuch* itself (VIII, 2626*s.v. *scheunst*) cites only. *der soldaten zu fueß ihr ABC*, 1615, a title that is presumably identical with *Alphabetum pro Tyrone Pedestri, oder der Soldaten zu Fueß ihr A B C . . . Beschrieben von Johann Jacobi von Wallhausen*. Franckfurt am Mayn, 1615 (*British Museum Catalogue*). The *Allgem. deutsche Biographie* XL, 748 cites *Kriegskunst zu Fuß*, Oppenheim, 1615, perhaps another form of the title of the same book, which is inaccessible to me. Weigand's *Deutsches Worterbuch* records among its sources: *Corpus militare* 1617, *Kriegskunst zu Pferde* 1616, *Kriegß Manual* 1616. The *British Museum Catalogue* records five German works of Wallhausen, together with four French, and one Dutch translation. In my own possession are the following:

1. Archiley Kriegskunst Darinnen gelehret vnd furgetragen werden die *initia* vnd *fundamenta* dieser Edlen Kriegskunst. Vor diesem mehrmals also *compendiosè, methodicè, dilucidè* vnd *recto* an Tag gegeben. Von Johann Jacobi von Wallhausen bestelten Obristen / &c Mit sonderbarer Freyheit begabet Getruckt zu Hanaw / In verlegung deß *Authoris* Anno 1617, 4 leaves, 77 pp, 11 plates, folio (Cited as *Archiley*)

2 *Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd* / Darinnen gelehret werden, die Fundament der Cavallery / in vier Theilen. Als im Lantzierer / Kuhrissierer / Carabiner / vnd Tragoner an Tag gegeben / Durch *Johannem-Jacobi* von Wallhausen / der löblichen Statt Dantzig bestelten Obristen Wachtmeister vnd Hauptmann Mit Rom. Kay. May Freyheit nicht nachzudrucken begnadet Gedruckt zu Franckfurt am Mayn / bey Wolfgang Hofmann / In Verlegung Wilhelm Fitzers Im Jahr M DC XXXIV, 4 leaves, 76 pp, 43 plates, folio (Cited as *Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd*) This edition, which I have not found cited elsewhere, is a reprint of the edition of 1616, cited in the *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie* XL, 748 After the present article had been written, I discovered a copy of the 1616 edition, without title-page, in the Avery Collection of Columbia University. In general, the edition of 1634 reproduces the text of 1616, and therefore, unless otherwise noted, the instances cited from the edition of 1634 may be dated as early as 1616

3. *Defensio Patriae* Oder Landtrettung Darinnen gezeigt wirdt / I Wie alle vnd jede in der werthen Christenheit Potentaten / Regenten / Statte vnnd Communen / jhre vnd der jhrigen Vnderthanen Rettung vnd Schutzung anstellen sollen. II. Der *Modus bene belligerandi*, viel hundert Jahr bißher gefahlet. durch *Iohann Jacobi* von Wallhausen / derzeit Churf Maintz bestelten Obr Leutenant Gedruckt im Verlag / Daniel vnnd David *Aubry* vnd Clement Schleichen / Buchhändlern in Franckfurt am Main 1621; 32, 197 pp, 12 plates, folio (Cited as *Landtrettung*.)

Wallhausen was evidently a man of education, as well as a lin-

preceding article (see pp 321-2, 325) In a long introduction he shows a detailed knowledge of the sources of Danish and Swedish history which could only have been derived from actual work with these authorities (see also pp 324-5), he even explains the policy of "our historians" in treating contradictory sources (pp 321-2), he notes a few minor errata (pp 322-3), chiefly typographical, some of which are so minute that it is impossible to believe that an ordinary reviewer would have noticed them, there can be little doubt that the above remarks are the result of Smollett's own work with the histories of Denmark and Sweden

XIII, 107-20 (Feb, 1762) Poland, Lithuania, and Prussia A long introductory dissertation on the causes of differences between nations suggests Smollett, the reviewer refers (p 113) to "a similar story in the Danish annals", he shows some knowledge of the nature of the sources for the histories of Lithuania and Prussia (p 120), with which Smollett has been somewhat tenuously connected

XIII, 381-92 (May, 1762) Russia The reviewer (pp 382-3, 384, 386) reprimands the historians for plagiarizing Voltaire and Busching, and cites passages of the history of Russia which have been transcribed verbatim from these authors, it is difficult to see how a reviewer could have detected this debt unless he had recently been reading these sources with considerable care Smollett was at this very time engaged in the translation of Voltaire's *Works*, which included the "History of the Russian Empire under Peter the Great", and he had, seven months before, reviewed the first volume of Busching's *Geography*, which contains the account of Russia

It is amusing to notice that in at least six of the above articles Smollett seems to have reviewed sections of the history which he either edited or compiled, in treating other parts the *Critical Review* is frequently caustic in regard to the style and bulk of the work, but in reviews of sections which Smollett apparently compiled the tone is nearly always one of unqualified enthusiasm.

GERMAN LEXICOGRAPHY

PART VII

The material for the present article comes from the works of Johann Jacobi von Wallhausen. The dates of his birth and of his death are unrecorded; the few known facts of his life are derived from his books: he learned the art of war in the Netherlands, and must have been a soldier of long experience when he wrote his works, published in the first quarter of the seventeenth century. All of these works are now extremely rare. the *Quellen-Verzeichnis zum Deutschen Wörterbuch*, Göttingen 1910, cites only the *Manuale militare, oder Kriegß-manual*, Frankfurt 1616,

whereas the *Worterbuch* itself (VIII, 2626 *s. v. *scheunst*) cites only. *der soldaten zu fueß ihr ABC*, 1615, a title that is presumably identical with. *Alphabetum pro Tyrone Pedestri, oder der Soldaten zu Fueß ihr A B C . . . Beschrieben von Johann Jacobi von Wallhausen*. Franckfurt am Mayn, 1615 (*British Museum Catalogue*). The *Allgem. deutsche Biographie* XL, 748 cites: *Kriegskunst zu Fuß*, Oppenheim, 1615, perhaps another form of the title of the same book, which is inaccessible to me. Weigand's *Deutsches Worterbuch* records among its sources. *Corpus militare* 1617, *Kriegskunst zu Pferde* 1616; *Kriegß Manual* 1616. The *British Museum Catalogue* records five German works of Wallhausen, together with four French, and one Dutch translation. In my own possession are the following.

1 *Archiley Kriegskunst* Darinnen gelehret vnd fürgetragen werden die *intra* vnd *fundamenta* dieser Edlen Kriegskunst. Vor diesem niehmals also *compendiosè, methodicè, dilucidè* vnd *recto* an Tag gegeben Von Johann Jacobi von Wallhausen bestelten Obristen / &c Mit sonderbarer Freyheit begabet Getruckt zu Hanaw / In verlegung deß *Authoris* Anno 1617, 4 leaves, 77 pp, 11 plates, folio (Cited as *Archiley*)

2 *Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd* / Darinnen gelehret werden, die Fundament der Cavallery / in vier Theilen Als im Lantzierer / Kuhrissierer / Carabiner / vnd Triagoner an Tag gegeben / Durch *Johannem-Jacobi* von Wallhausen / der loblichen Statt Dantzig bestelten Obristen Wachtmeister vnd Hauptmann Mit Rom. Kay. May Freyheit nicht nachzudrucken begnadet Gedruckt zu Franckfurt am Mayn / bey Wolfgang Hofmann / In Verlegung Wilhelm Fitzers Im Jahr M DC XXXIV, 4 leaves, 76 pp, 43 plates, folio (Cited as *Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd*) This edition, which I have not found cited elsewhere, is a reprint of the edition of 1616, cited in the *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie* XL, 748 After the present article had been written, I discovered a copy of the 1616 edition, without title-page, in the Avery Collection of Columbia University In general, the edition of 1634 reproduces the text of 1616, and therefore, unless otherwise noted, the instances cited from the edition of 1634 may be dated as early as 1616.

3. *Defensio Patriae* Oder Landtrettung Darinnen gezeigt wirdt / I Wie alle vnd jede in der werthen Christenheit Potentaten / Regenten / Statte vnnnd Communen / ihre vnd der jhrigen Vnderthanen Rettung vnd Schutzzung anstellen sollen. II Der *Modus bene belligerandi*, viel hundert Jahr bißher gefählet durch *Johann Jacobi* von Wallhausen / derzeit Churf. Mantz bestelten Obr Leutenant Gedruckt im Verlag / Daniel vnnnd David Aubrij vnd Clement Schleichen / Buchhandlern in Franckfurt am Main 1621, 32, 197 pp., 12 plates, folio. (Cited as *Landtrettung*)

Wallhausen was evidently a man of education, as well as a lin-

guist: Latin authors are often quoted and translated by him, and in the *Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd* he undertakes to refute certain arguments of Georg Basta in his *Governo della Cavalleria* by extensive translation from the Italian text.¹ Accordingly, we find in Wallhausen's books numerous foreign words, Latin, Italian, and French, some of which were adopted into German, whilst others failed to find further sponsors. In addition, Wallhausen uses a large number of native German words interesting for their form or meaning. His technical military terms are of especial importance on account of the accompanying drawings or descriptions, which perfectly elucidate their meaning.

Some of the words here excerpted are not recorded by lexicographers, others antedate the instances recorded for New High German, or else they appear in a new meaning, still others are survivors of an older period, and as such have not been recognized in the language of the seventeenth century.

ALTERIREN. So werden auch viel Standts Personen an jhrer Gesundheit oft alterirt, inficirt, auch bißweilen gar verderbt. (*Landtrettung* 38.)

ANSCHLAGUNG: Als, so der Spieß auff der Erden vor dir stehet, wie in *numer.* 7. so ist die erste *tempo*, die Anschlagung der lincken Handt ahn Spieß, (*Landtrettung* 84).

ARMPFEIFE: Armschienen oder Armpfeiffen mit sein Schulterblätter vollkommen, eyserne Handschuhen (*Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd* 4^a).

AUßSPENDUNG: Hier muß man zusammen bringen ein Hauffen Lasterhafftiger Menschen, welchen auch nach Gelts Außspendung zu schmeichlen, vnd wieder den Feindt ziehen muß (*Landtrettung*, Praefatio, 21).

BANDELIER-REUTER: daß die Vnderthanen gutte starcke Pferdt zu jhrem Ackerbauwen halten müssen, da hat man ein schone Gelegenheit auch etwas an Reuterey zu *Carpiner* oder Bandthier Reuter zum Außzug zu gebrauchen (*Landtrettung* 61); Wie aber vnd wasserley Gestalt die Reuterey zu bewahren, das ist in der Kriegskunst zu Pferdt vnd in der Ritterkunst angemeldet, bey der Harquebusirer oder Bandellier Reuterey angedeutet, nemblich, daß

¹It must be noted that a German edition of Basta's *Governo della Cavalleria* appeared at Frankfurt in 1614

sie haben müssen ein Bruststück, ohne oder mit einem hinterstück, ein gut Bandellierrohr, so er in einem Riemen am Hals hangendt, fuhret, ein paar gutter Pistolen, sein Puluerflasche sampt Spanner mit Puluer vnnnd Kugelen versehen (*ib.* 63); Das dritte Capitel tractiret vom Harquebusierer, oder Bandellier-Reutter, darinnen seine Bewehrung, neben seinen Handgriffen, so an einem Rohr zu observiren, (*Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd*, fol. 11^b); Das dritte Capitel, von Harquebusierer, Carbiner, oder Bandellier-Reutter, wie starck ihre Compagny, sampt Befelchshabern gehort zu seyn (*ib.* fol. 14^a), Der Harquebusierer, Carbiner oder Bandellier Reuter, ist das dritte Theil der Cavallery, vnd wird die leichte Reuterey geheissen. Beydes auß den Ursachen, daß er nicht so schwarz, wie die zwey erste Theil der Cavallery, armiert, auch das er nicht so ein schwarzes Pferd wie diese bedarff. Er fuhret seinen Namen vom langen Rohr, oder von dem Bandellier, so er am Hals, daran sein Rohr vest anhangend ist (*ib.* p. 19^a). From these instances it appears that *Harquebusierer*, *Carbiner*, and *Bandellier-Reuter* were synonymous terms to Wallhausen, designating a light-horseman, as over against the lancer and the cuirassier. It appears furthermore, that the *Carbiner* at this time was not a "kurze Reiterflinte," as it is defined in our dictionaries, but a long light gun, as over against the heavy gun of the musketeer, which had to be supported upon a *Haken* when it was fired.

BEWEHRUNG: Dieses vom Fußvolck· Wollen zu der Reuterey Bewehrung schreiten (*Landtrettung* 61); Wann ein Obrigkeit mit den Bewehrungen, ein Richtigkeit bey den Vnderthanen hatt, . . . da dann fur allen—Diengen diese *discretion* ein Obrigkeit zu gebrauchen hat, daß sie die Bewehrung vnnnd die Kleidung nicht zu gleich fuhrnehme, . . . gar allen Muth darzu sincken liessen vnd also weder zur Bewehrung, noch zur Bekleidung sich wolten lencken lassen, (*ib.* 63). In many other places, Wallhausen uses the word *Armatur*, e. g.: Der Kuhrissierer braucht ein Armatur oder Waffung, die mehr *defensiva*, (*Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd* 13^b).

BRILL Brillen, darinnen man das Ladtpuluer hat, (*Archuley* 30); Ein Brill, darinnen das Ladpuluer (*ib.* 32), Brillen, so da Puluerfaßlin, müssen also seyn, daß vngefehr in eines 3. oder 4. Carthaunen schuß ladung gehe, mit einem Boden vnden Der Oberboden wirdt außgelassen, vnd vmb denselben von aussen, ein Beutel von gutem fetgeschmirtem Kalbfell Leder, fest herumb, mit

kleinen Naglen angenaglet, welchen Beutel man kan vff vnd zu thun, seyn sehr bequem vmb eylendts zu laden, wie auch das Puluer trucken fur Regen vnnd Windt zu halten (*ib.* 33), So man laden will, soll ein Handreicher mit dem Ladpuluer, so in dem Brill ist. fertig seyn, fahre mit der Schauffel hinein, fulle sie, so sie gefullet, klopfte hinten auff den Still, daß das Puluer nicht gehauft in der Schauffel liege, vnd man also im Geschutz zettele, da dann solches vbriges Puluer im abklopfen in Brill hinein felt (*ib.* 49). On plate 3, No. 4, we have the picture of a *Brill*, with leather top and drawing-string. The noun is masculine here, as also in Dutch, where, however, I have not met with it in this special meaning.

COLORT anmahnete, daß sie jhre Hosen, Item strumpffe, vnd Hutte von colorten farben, als Blaw, Roht, Galb &c. (vnd andere Farben, ausserhalb Schwartz) jhnen zu dem Schutzenrock zeugten (*Landtrettung* 64).

COURTESIREN Seind Wir Teutschen allein so furwitzig vnnd vnserem Gelt so feindt, daß solches in frembden Landen, mit reysen, vnd Hauser Pracht besehen, courtesiren, galanisiren, vnd dantzen, mit hundert auch tausent Gulden hingeben müssen (*Landtrettung* 38).

CULASSE: Das Zundtloch mit Stahl gefudert, vnnd eingeschraubt, behoret ein wenig von dem Grundt der Seelen, fürgesetzt zuseyn, nicht stracks an das Ende der Culassen. (*Archiley* 13), Der starcke gebende Guß, ist in dem Metal so hinten vmb die Kammer vnnd Culassen, auch vornwertz sich außgibt. Im glatten Guß wird das Metal im Gewicht sich finden 5350. lb. die vbrige 1050. lb. kommen zu den Friesen, Delphinen, Naben, Culassen, vnnd Starckte vmb die Kammer. (*ib.* 21). Die Culasse oder Schwanzstuck (*ib.* 36); Die *Circumferentz* oder dicke deß Stucks hinten an der Culasse, da das Stuck am dicksten. (*ib.* 39). The French term *Culasse* seems not to have been recorded in German dictionaries: the translation *Schwanzstuck* (compare the passage from page 36 just cited), is quoted by the *DWb.* from Jacobsson, an author not listed in the *Quellen-Verzeichnis*.

DEFENSIONWESEN: vnnd mit denselbigen Vnderthanen das Defensionwesen, muß ins Werck gesetzt vnd gericht werden, (*Landtrettung*, Praefatio 29).

DELPHIN: Das Geschutz muß recht in den Delphinen hangendt im Gewicht seyn. (*Archiley* 14); Der Ziehrgebende Guß, ist in

demjenigen Metal, so an den Friesen, Reiffen, Gurteln, Delphinen, Naben (*ib.* 21). The *Delphin* is pictured on plate 2, no. 10, the *DWb.* defines it, without quoting an author. 'die handhaben bei kanonen und morsern, denen man die gestalt eines delphins zu geben pflegt.' The term 'dolphin' is used in the same sense in English.

DIGNITET da doch jhnen, Kriegsveistendigen, wohl wissendt ist, die hohe, ruhmliche Digniteten vnd Ehre, so den *Iurisperitis* . . . auch gebuhre (*Landtrettung*, Praefatio, 16).

DOPPELSOLDNER daß zu einem Fahnlein er etwaß mehr als den dritten theil zu Piquenirer oder Doppelsoldener nehme, also daß er zwey theil Mußquetirer, vnnd ein theil (doch ein Man oder 20. mehr) an Doppelsoldenern nehme . . . will auch das andere gehorig darbey sein, als dem Mußquetirer vnd Doppelsoldner sein Sturmhaube (*Landtrettung* 60); Das dritte Capittel. Wie man die Doppelsoldner oder Piquenierers mit jhren langen Spiessen abrichten, vnd lehren soll. Bißhero von den Schutzen vnd Musquetirern, wollen besehen wie sich die Piquenierer oder Doppelsoldtner mit jhren Spiessen vnnd jhrem Obergewehr verhalten, (*ib.* 82); Durch Mußquetierers vnd Piquenierers oder Doppelsoldners, eines gantzen Regiments, Fahnleins oder Trippenweiß, wie ich dir im ersten Buch der Kriegskunst zu Fuß Demonstration gethan habe. (*Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd* 1). The *DWb.* cites *Doppelsoldner* from sixteenth century texts, in the literal meaning of one who gets double pay. In the above examples from Wallhausen, the word means simply 'pikeman,' as contrasted with the musketeers of an infantry regiment. In 1691 Stieler, as the *DWb.* points out, uses *Doppelsoldner* in the sense of 'dragoon.'

DRILLMEISTER: daß sie haben besondere *Professores, Doctores* vnnd *Magistros* darzu gehalten, (so sie Waffenlehrer oder Trillmeister geheissen) jhre Jugend die Kriegsdisciplin vnd allerley Arth zu streiten zu lehren, vnd sie darzu anzufuhren. (*Landtrettung* 34).

ERHEISCH: da er doch mit 30. 40. ja oft ein halbes Jahr zu thun solte haben, wann er sie nach Erheisch vnd Forderung solte abrichten vnnd uben, (*Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd* 27^a), daß die Stelle jedem Theyl nach Erheisch seiner Qualitet, vnd Quantitet gehore in acht genommen zu seyn, (*ib.* 44^b); so da beydes raumes vnd

enges Feld, nach Erheisch der Noth vnd Gelegenheit leiden muß (*ib.*), nach erheisch, Erforderung vnnnd Nothurfft (*ib.* 47^b).

FLASCHENHANGSEL An seinem Gurtel hat er ein Flaschenhangsel, von Leder gemacht, darinnen die Pulverflasche, sampt Spanner einhanget, vnnnd daran vest gemacht, die Lang der Porteflasch nimpt er nach seiner Maß, so jhm gefällig. Auf dem Hangsel hat er ein Sacklein, wie am Bandellier deß Mußquetierers, darinn er seine Kugeln vnd Wuschzeug hat: (*Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd* 19^b). Neither *Flaschenhangsel* nor *Hangsel* is recorded in the *DWb.*; both words seem to be synonyms of *Porteflasch*· compare for example the *Erläuterung der Figuren im dritten Capitel* (p. 20^b)· Num 4 Ist die Porteflasch mit Pulverflasch vnd Spanner. The illustration corresponds exactly to the *Flaschenhangsel* as above described. Another instance of *Porteflasch*, which is likewise unrecorded in the *DWb.*, is found in the same passage (p. 19^b)· Aber meines Gutduncken halte ich die Porteflasche, als in Niderland vnter den Harquebusiereis gebräuchlichen, die da in Fig. 10. Num. zu sehen ist.

FLASCHENLEDER· Es gehoret auch einem jeden Mußquetirer an ein porte oder Flassenhangel, ein starcke beinern Puluerflasche zu haben, darinnen er zum wenigsten 2. Pfundt Puluer bewahren kan, an dem Flaschenleder, darinnen die Puluer Flasche hangt, kan er auch ein Säcklein haben, Kuglen vnd anders darin zu thun (*Landtrettung* 60); hatt ein Puluerflasche, an einem Flaschenledder, daran ein Sacklein gemacht, darinnen er seine Kugeln, vnd Fedtlappen thut, hangen, (*ib.* 75). The word seems to be another synonym of *Flaschenhangsel*.

FULMINIREN: so da also gesinnet, vnnnd solche Leuthe seyn, da sich einer oder anderer hier vber mäulen, *sacriren*, *fulminiren*, mit Bedraungen solches zu rechnen, herfür thun würde, (*Landtrettung* 197). Weigand cites *fulminiren* from Nehring (1710); *sacriren* seems to be unrecorded.

FURBRENGNUS: wie kan er mit seinen Ohren allein, alles Klagen vnd Furbrengnus, anhoren, (*Landtrettung*, Praefatio 19).

FURQUET, FURQUET: sampt einer Furquet oder Gabell, (*Landtrettung* 60), halte die Musquet, . . . bringe sie zur rechten Seiten, schicke die Fürquet mit der lincken Handt zur rechten, bringe die Furquet zur Musqueten, fasse die Musquet mit der Gabelen mitten

im Gewicht, daß die Furquet vnder die Musquet zu liegen komme, (*ib.* 79); so weiset man jhnen, wie er widerumb laden soll, als, hebe auff die Musquet mit dem Furquet, die Musquet vnnd Furquet samen fassendt, (*ib.*). In four of these instances *Furquet* is feminine, in one it is either masculine or neuter. As a rule, Wallhausen uses the German equivalent, *Gabel*.

FUßSTELLUNG Im letzten Schritt, die andere vbrige, als, 23. 24. 25. wie dann die Fußstellungen jedenen *tempo* weisen in den *nu.* wie lang ein Fuß vmb den anderen vorstehe, wann der lincke, wann der rechte, (*Landtrettung* 81).

FUßZUG Dann anfanglich von Erbauung der Statt Rom, biß auff die Zeit *Dur Gratian*, pflegt der Fußzug mit gantzen Harnischen vnnd Sturmhauben, oder Helmen verwahret zu werden, (*Landtrettung* 25). *Fußzug* is the collective term for *Fußvolk*, or *Kriegsvolk zu Fuß*, both of which occur on the same page it is formed by analogy to *reisiger zu* or *zeug*, the technical term for cavalry in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

HAUER. die Seiten Gewehr, dem Mußquetirer ein breiden guten Hauwer, so er am Halß tragt, vnnd dem Doppelsoldner ein lang Seiten gewehr dem Mußquetirer einen kurtzen Hauwer, damit er im scharmutzieren, im treffen, sich nicht hindere, im kehren vnd wenden, auch sonst oft so gutt, als ein Axt oder Beyel ist, (*Landtrettung* 60); ein gutt Bandhieroehr so ein grosse Kugel schiesset, vnnd zwo oder eine gutte Pistolen, sein Puluerflasch vnnd Spanner, ein gut hauwendt Seiten gewehr, (*ib.* 65)

KANAL. Das Puluer ist eher als das Geschütz erfunden worden. Hernacher die Canalen oder das Geschütz selbst, darinnen das Puluer seinen effect wurcket, (*Archiley* 2), Die Seele so der *Canal* deß Geschützes, *Num.* 4. (*ib.* 22); Die Lufft in dem Geschütz der Seelen *causirt* den Stoß, dann das Feuer weil es in einem Augenblick *generirt*, durch die *Canal* zur eusseren Lufft hinaus will (*ib.* 46).

KAVALLIERER: der lobliche Cavallierer Herr Georg Basta, (*Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd* fol. 1j^a); deß Woledlen, Gestrengen, hochverstandigen, wolerfahrenen Cavallierer, Herrn Dietrichen Doinhoff, &c. (*ib.* fol. 1j^b), Arbeit, Abrichtung vnd Vbung vnserer Furfahrender loblichsten Cavallierers (*ib.* 2^a); einer von den eltesten Cavallierern (*ib.* 22^b); auch den erfahnesten Cavallierern (*ib.* 24^b); neben vieler anderer trefflicher, berühmter Cavallierers, (*ib.*

25^b); was den gemeynen Reuttern vnd Cavallierers *particulariter* vnd *communiter* zu wissen nothig (*ib.* 27^b). The usual form *Cavallier* is likewise found, perhaps not as frequently as *Cavallierer*, in the following instance, the word designates some kind of fortification. Eine *Contra Batterey*, Katze, oder Cauallirer in einer Festung zu beschiesen, muß mit drey Battereien Creutzweiß vnd recht zu angegriffen seyn. (*Archiley* 61), for 'Katze' in this sense see *DWb* v, 290, *Cavallierer* in a similar transferred sense seems not to have been noted by German lexicographers; it is derived from the French compare the *Mémoires de Messire Martin du Bellay*, describing events of the year 1536 (*Nouvelle Collection des Mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France*, par Michaud et Poujoulat, Paris 1881, Tome v, p. 510).

Derrière chacune encongneure des quatre tours qui sont en laditte ceinture, le sieur de Langey fit commencer un grand cavalier, et, parce que les tours n'estoyent suffisantes pour soutenir une furieuse baterie, avoit aussi faict commencer de grandes trenchées par dedans, de cavalier en cavalier, afin que là où l'ennemy auroit batu et les tours et la coutine. il trouvast nouvel obstacle

KERNSTANGE: Die zweite, so die Kernstange so Creutzweiß hunden seyn eingegossen vnd durchbohret, nicht recht wol mit dem Metal anligen, sondern einige Lufft oder Rißlein darzwischen gelassen wirdt, da dann solches auch principalich der furnembsten Vrsachen eine ist der Zerreissung vnd Zersprengung der Stucken. Item so die Kernstange zu lang in der *Circumferentz* deß Hindertheils am Stuck, einwertz gesenckt seyn. (*Archiley* 72). The *DWb.* only refers to the word as cited by Frisch (1741).

KOMBATIREN: vnnnd es die Gelegenheit giebt, daß Fußvolck gegen Reuterey *Combaturen*, vnd sich von hunden zuverwahren solten, (*Landtrettung* 103).

KOMMIßFLEISCH: daß den Soldaten . . . guttes herliges *commiß* Brodt gegeben worden, sie habens nicht wollen ahnsehen. . . . Es ist auch geschehen, das sie das jenige *commiß* Fleisch so mann jhn geben, gegen den Erdbodem ahngeschlagen. (*Landtrettung* 175.)

KOMPILIREN: Du *Obtrectator* vnnnd *Adulator*, der du meine Arbeit tadelst vnnnd verachtest, vnd sagen darffst meine Arbeit seye ein *complurtes* Werck, ja, auch von andern gelehret, (*Landtrettung*, Praefatio 32).

KONTRABATTERIE Die Schultern müssen am Schußloch (so man kein *Contrabatterien* zubefahren) beyderseits 11. Schuh hoch, vnd 23. dick seyn (*Archiley* 28), So man *Contrabatterie* zu befahren, Muß man die Schießlöcher vorn auß nur 4. oder 3. Schuh weit, vnd hinten in der *Batterie* 18. Schuhlang, mit Schantzkorben oder Erden besetzen, (*ib.* 29).

KORNETT: Folgt, wie die Reuterey jhr *Compagnie* richten solle, so man ein Cornet oder Fahne Reuter haben kan, so nimbt man sie zu 60. oder mehr starck, darunder der Rittmeister . . . Leutenant, Cornet oder Fahnrich, Quartiermeister, Zween Corporaln, daß also die Fahne Reuter in 2. Corporalschafft getheilet wirdt, (*Landtrettung* 68). This use of *Kornett* as 'Fahne' is not recorded by Weigand before 1664.

KORPORALISCH. Das Wasser so im Salpeter, ist ein Corporalisch Element (*Archiley* 3), Die Corporalische Lufft durchs Feuer vnnnd Hitze gedrieben oder gemacht, such die elementarische Lufft dem Feuer am nechsten. (*ib.* 4), In solcher gestalt, dieweil *naturaliter* das Feuer in den Corporalischen Elementen nicht wohnet, (*ib.* 10), So sich das Feuer rondt vmbgeschlossen findt, vnd das Corporalisch Element nicht leiden will, raumbt es an allen orten vmb sich, wo dann das Corporisch Element am schwechsten, da bricht es am ersten auß, nach der Lufft zu. (*ib.*).

KORPORISCH: Das eine so da am Corporischen Element daß Metals vnd der Kugeln anhanget. (*Archiley* 4), also daß in demselbigen, so das leichte Element die Lufft, nicht bey dem Corporischen seyn will, (*ib.*), Dann die hohe subtile vnd lufftige Elementen, seyn den schweren vnnnd Corporischen also einverleibet, (*ib.* 5); Aber doch nicht dero Gestalt, daß das Corporische oder Irrdische Element der *Effectuant* sey. Dann ob schon die Kohlen so da Corporisch, als von Holtz, . . . Also daß ein anders Element, so das Feuer in den Corporischen Elementen sich einverleibt halten muß, (*ib.*).

KORPORALSCHAFT: Schulz cites the word from the year 1608, without definition, Weigand cites it from the year 1664. From the *Landtrettung* it appears that in 1621 the normal company of infantry was divided into three *Korporalschaften*, each subdivided into ten or eleven *Rotten* of eight men each: dessen zum Exempel, wollen wir nehmen ein *Compagnie* oder *Fahnlein*, so da 300. Mann starck ist, darunder 160. Musquetirer 120. Piquenirer, der lange

Spiesse, so samen 280 Mann, die vbrige seynd die Befelchshaber. vnnd dero *adhaerenten*, die Rotten wollen wir nehmen, 8. Mann starck, finden sich zwantzig Musquetier, vnnd 12. Rotten Spieszen. welche wie oben gemeldt in drey Corporalschafften, daß jedere gleich viel Musquetierer vnd Piquenierer oder Spiessen habe, gleich getheilt seindt, . . . daß nemblich, der halbe Theil deß Fahnleins Musquetierer vnd Spiesse vor dem Fahnlein, vnd die andere Helffte, nach dem Fahnlein, folgen, deio Gestalt, daß anderthalbe Corporalschafft nachfolgen, welches also geschiehet, daß nemblich, erst von Musquetierein die erste Corporalschafft vornen ahnziehe, darauff von der zweyte Corporalschafft der halbe Theil. auff diese, die Spiesse aller drey Corporalschafften, also, daß das Fahnlein Mitten vnder den Spiessen fliehe, (p. 91). For the cavalry *Korporalschaft* see under *Kornett*, above.

KREUZSTENGLEIN *Num* 4. Auch ein Instrument so man gebrauchet, vnd in ein Geschutz einstecket, so da anzeigt, ob das Stuck durchauß recht vnnd nicht krumb gebohret. *Num*. 5 Ein Creutzstenglein zu demselbigen gebrauch. (*Archiley* 39); Etliche brauchen Creutzstanglin. (*ib.* 68).

KUGELLUPFER, KUGELZIEHER. Der Carthaunen Zugehör ist, . . . Kugel Zieher, Kugel Außbohrer, Kugel Lupffer. . . . Der Kugellupffer wird gemacht wie ein Anzieher, gar dun, 2. Zoll an dem Ende, mit einer Schrauben in dem Stamper, oder sonsten ein zuschrauben von Mössing oder Ringeisen, damit im Geschutz kein Fewer verrsacht werde. (*Archiley* 38); *Num*. 8. Ein Kugellupffer. (*ib.* 39), Die Kuglen so stecken bleiben, werden mit Schrauben oder Kugelziehern, oder mit Kugel Luffern herauß geholet. (*ib.* 76).

W. KURRELMAYER

PUSHKIN AND GOETHE

No word, claims Nietzsche, is abused to the extent of the inoffensive "and." Perhaps the very coupling of the universalist and thinker Goethe with Pushkin would shock even a Russian. In his youth Pushkin is usually accepted as a disciple of French classicism; in the days of maturity, as servile satellite of Byron and Shakespeare. Why then *Goethe and Pushkin*?

Temperamentally at opposite poles—what could be further from Olympus than Pushkin's hysterical outcries to his child-wife?—the poets, albeit contemporaries and known to each other, appear at first sight hardly ever to meet on common ground. For one thing, Pushkin's life was cut short by the tragic fate which in his native land is the concomitant of genius. Had he lived longer, the parallel might have been facilitated. As it is, philosopher Pushkin was not. Neither was he evolutionist in the sense of a Vico, Herder, or Goethe. His interest in nature was rhetorical, not sentimental. Inarticulate *Sehnsucht* remained as foreign to him as any Protean affinity with the "Vegetable Universe." Whatever his orientation toward German thought, he never, not even at the zenith of power, matched the facility with which he had scribbled. *Stances*, *Mon Portrait*, or the avid thirst which later impelled him to consume the English of Miss Bailey. Moreover, the average reader calls to mind but a single unfinished opus *Faust*. A mite, when one recalls the astounding assimilative potency of the Russian as shown in echoes of Parry, Chénier, Ariosto, Byron, La Motte Fouqué, Rousseau, Schiller, Burger, Karamsin, Shakespeare, Derjavin, Hoffmann, Tasso, La Fontaine, Virgil, Boileau, Musset, Scott, Sachs, to mention but a few.

All the more startling to come across the name of Goethe in the writings of Pushkin's critics already in 1821. An "inhabitant of Butirk," disturbed by the acclaim accorded *Ruslan and Ludmila*, warns that native rhymesters, rushing in the dubious footsteps of Schiller and Goethe, are doomed to self-destruction on the rock of romanticism. A weightier disapproval is voiced simultaneously by Viasemsky, who upbraids his colleague for lightheartedly exchanging native shirt for German coat and boots.

The appearance of *Evgeny Onegin* ushers in parallels not alone with Byron, Pushkin's alleged liege, but with Goethe. Indeed, Polevoi holds the Weimar keynote too dominant to be chance, to which the *Messenger of Europe* hurries to remonstrate that Pushkin is a Classicist, and that Goethe has yet to show something of the scope of *Onegin*. In turn, Polevoi insists that of Godunov's god-fathers *Egmont* is the most virile, and that Pushkin's *Faust* could grace the *Schriften* without the slightest suspicion of forgery. Unfortunately, the prolonged battle of wits deteriorated before long into personal squabbling.

In the end, Polevoi yields. He admits that, though the "great

Pagan" held Pushkin spellbound in the interregnum, when, free from Byron's yoke, he had not yet succumbed to the wizardry of Shakespeare, there was in the Slav too little taste for Pantheistic flight to endow the magnet with life and force.

This opinion is handed down to the next generation, that of the realists, Dobrolubov and Spasevich. Curiously, Pushkin's most venomous vilifier, Bulgarin alone interprets his *Volkstumlichkeit* and *Sturm und Drang* as an overt revolt against the French and a lining up with Frankfurt and Strassburg. That, in spite of Pushkin's alleged ignorance of German and his deafness to the rapidly gathering social thunderbolt.

Saturated with Kant and Schlegel, the romanticists Odojevsky, Gnedich, and Venevitinov, are definitely kinder. Pushkin is crowned patriarch of Russian letters and put on a par with Goethe. Now, too, his political radicalism is pointed out by the German translator of *Boris*, Baron Rosen, and, in more glowing terms, by Varnhagen von Ense.

These eulogies pass unheeded. Alone, Polevoi warns against the interference from the West. The Slavs, he contends, are past barbarism and do not lean on professional panegyrists for the approbation of their Boudoir-Laureate.

A new note is struck by Belinsky. Pushkin's "music, felt in one's mouth" captivates him, yet, failing to decipher philosophic innuendo in the "mosaic" characterisation, he brands the poet an effete epigone of the French. Even if one were to allow for Russia's monotonous landscape, tortuous history, and embryonic national consciousness, even then, says Belinsky, Pushkin has not half realized his mission. Where is Homeric dignity, Byronic demonism, Schiller's all-embracing sympathy? All is submerged in resonant rimes. If Goethe is the giant Antaeus, invincible, since his mother-earth provides him with ever increasing vigor, Pushkin envisages all phenomena as a charming, but static, image. *Faust* is degraded to an anaemic variation of a glorious theme; its hero—to a blasé, a decadent wit.

Of course, this verdict becomes axiomatic. It does away with the need to defend ideas. A luke-warm appraisal by Belinsky's henchmen, Chernishevsky and Druzhinin, culminates in the vitriolic attack of the adamantine Pisarev, stern opponent of "pure" art. A sole dissenter is Grigoriev who underscores the liberalism of the aristocrat-poet, his unfailing devotion to justice, and the singularly Goethesque color of his literary criticism.

The seventies contribute a more historical approach without advancing the German cause. No exception is made for *Faust*. For, if the curly-haired *lyceist* scrawled in his first note-book a few hieroglyphics and intimated their source, the chrysalis was doomed, we are told, at birth.

1880 heralds a complete revolution in the appreciation of Pushkin. Suddenly he emerges a national hero, Savior, Seer, God. Everything lies prostrate before him: Kluchevsky, Goncharov, Turgenev. Gogol extolls the awareness of his mission, and stamps him the most potent, the sole manifestation of Slav genius. Reading his own *Weltanschauung* into *Oniegin*, that of humility and peace, Dostoevsky coins the dictum: "Pushkin is not alone Russian: he is the first Russian" He bares, Dostoevsky insists, a humanitarianism broader than that of Schiller, Cervantes, even Shakespeare. Goethe alone is his brother in arms.

The thesis that Alexander Sergeievich obtained his spiritual baptism at the court of Karl August obtains further corroboration in the work of Veselovsky who reasons that already in *Zarskoe* Sasha had thrilled not alone at Wieland's *Oberon* and Herder's *Cid*, but at *Werther* and *Renéke Fuchs*, translated some years later into the *Scenes from Knighthood* and *Papessa Johanna*. To Pushkin's artistry in the handling of those borrowed themes Veselovsky subscribes but halfheartedly.

By 1887 the acceptance of the German inheritance is widespread. Kudriavzev reveals that Pushkin's enforced southern stay was made bearable through communion with Schiller, A. Schlegel, and Goethe, whereas Kirpichnikov focuses his analysis on the white-flame romanticism pulsating in the *Tales* and *Ballads*. Well may Archangelsky interpret these as a brand of vague *Sehnsucht*, Mereshkovsky traces them to but one font—Goethe. Otherwise it could not be, he says. For the men are twins in creative instinct, aesthetics, in the very means by which they achieve inner equilibrium. To wit, their reaction to the literature of their day, and the striking struggle for light on the threshold of eternal darkness (Letter to Viasemsky, June 18, 1824).

However, the most comprehensive juxtaposition is that of Cheshenin, who supplies a Muscovite double for each of Goethe's characters. *Faust* lives in *Oniegin* with the Cain stigma of unquenchable doubt. *Maseppa*, *Salieri*, *Dubrovsky* are but so many *Egmonts* expiating excess in torture or death. *Boris* wears the mask

of *Götz*, burning for an abstraction, but deaf to individual suffering. *Clavijo* is recreated in the *Prisoner*, *Tasso* in *Lensky*. There is an unforgivable crime the transgression of *Schicklichkeit*, as condemnable in love as in hatred. And it is just this unerring perception of measure which makes for the greatness of *Tatiana*, the eastern *Iphigenia*. If one adds that each of Pushkin's martyrs sports under *Werther's* cloak Goethe's own bucolic jacket, Cheshnin's chart becomes irresistible.

Yet, two critics choose to disagree. One, Nekrasov, reads all resemblance between Pushkin and Goethe in terms of cognate temperament, the other, Dashkevich, marvels at Pushkin's triumph over his torn self, a victory unmatched by the empty idealism or detached Olympianism of Weimar.

The French stage their comeback in the analysis undertaken in 1900 by the Petersburg University. Yet, while Batushkov draws a parallel between Pushkin and Racine, he unearths the counterpart of Boris not in Hyppolite, but in Berlichingen. Similarly, when Kosmin brings to light Pushkin's indomitable championship of de Stael, he strengthens against his better judgment the knot with Germany.

So, through vicissitudes of misinterpretation, acclaim, neglect, condemnation, and final triumph, through "isms" and far-fetched collating with all the great spokesmen of the day, the Goethe-Pushkin thesis is nourished and fortified.

Since the pivot of the issue has been Pushkin's alleged inability to fight his way to *Faust* in the original, we will take up the evidence at hand. In the parental home, where the *Fraulein* chatted in anything but her native language, and in school, where exploits of Staufen and Habsburg were transmitted in French, Sasha found German a stumbling block. Yet two mates, both life-long comrades, soon unlocked to him a miraculous world. Delwig, as freshman conversant only with Russian, became in no time Pushkin's "living Lexicon, and inspired commentary" for the kingdom of Klopstock, Schiller, and Goethe. As customary with Pushkin, the sequence proceeds in a sweeping crescendo.

Even more far-reaching is the affection for Kuchelbecker, the "tape-worm," who eventually wears the nimbus of a God. It is to him that Pushkin turns in his hour of trial, imploring to sing "once more of love, fame, the Caucasus, and Schiller." A higher tribute still: "Kuchla" is eternalised in *Lensky*. Among the first

Kuchelbecker introduces Sasha to Kant, the "dusty old fool," who in less facetious moments emerges the equal of Seneca and Tacitus. Klopstock earns scorn, but with all the more fervor does Pushkin espouse Wieland's *Oberon*. By 1816, we have the Russian's own translation of Schiller's *Punschlied*, a testimonial to the poet's friendship with the liberal hussar Kaverin, and, more to the point, with Jukovsky, beloved and admired, though an admitted "Muscovite and German."

If Jukovsky magnanimously introduces the youth into all his literary projects, Sasha, in turn, marvels at the elder's facility. "The rascal, another tour de force" (To Gnedich, Sept. 22, 1812), such is his glowing comment on the profuse translations of Schiller, Tieck, Novalis, Jean Paul, Humboldt. However, it is Goethe who lends glamor to the *Almanach* with the *Roman Carnival*, *Trip to Italy*, *Fairy Tales*, *Letters from Switzerland*, *Herrmann and Dorothea*. These seedlings are to bring rich harvest. In his own poems Pushkin quotes whole sections from Jukovsky's *Count of Habsburg*, and *Boris* is but a *Falscher Demetrius* in full manhood.

With Sasha free from the discipline of school, the poets are inseparable. First Wieland absorbs them, then Goethe's lyrics. Some day the *Fischer* will scale a note of deeper tragedy in Pushkin's *Scamander*, and *Mignon* throb with fresh life in *Tavrída* and *Desire*.

Yet, Jukovsky's is not an undisputed hold. A convinced Racinian, Katenin introduces Alexander Sergeievich into Goethe's theory of historical evolution, and the "German" Turgenevs broadcast additional glories of Jena and Heidelberg. What could be more prophetic than that Pushkin refuses to burn his incense with the "lovers of wisdom" before the shrine of Schiller, and allies himself with the allegedly "vulgar" creator of *Faust*? A lasting memorial of this allegiance are the love-poems of 1819.

In the south the assimilation of Goethe brings even more succulent fruit. To *Mignon* Pushkin restores the poignant "Who has seen the country . . ." lost in Jukovsky's version. Even in his reader the poet presupposes a familiarity with Goethe. For epigraphs of *Caucasian Prisoner* and *Tavrída* he chooses "Gib meine Jugend mir zuruck" His own *Demon* Pushkin defends as a generic type, "of the kind of the great Goethe" (On *Demon*, 1824). Finally, to crown an abundant year, we are given the *Carriage of Life*, whose shadow world diverges from that of *Schwager Kronos* in but one essential: Pushkin faces the hereafter with a smile.

Every additional month bespeaks a closer contact with Weimar. Goethe, an emblem of quietist tolerance and enlightenment, announces himself, as formerly, through *Faust* and *Egmont*, but another, popular, sufferer casts his lugubrious shadow over the *Gypsies* and *Dubrovsky* Werther. To 1824 belongs the most quoted: "As I read the Bible, the Holy Ghost will sometime pull at my heartstrings, but I prefer Goethe and Shakespeare."

By this time Pushkin is master of German. He pleads with his brother to forward without delay the Berlin reviews of the *Prisoner*, together with all available tomes of the Classics. "But, my dear, if at all possible, buy, beg, steal for me the *Memoirs* of Fouqué! You have no idea what Fouqué means! He is more enchanting than Byron . . . a hundred times more colorful than Napoleon!" And, if he contrasts the "half deceased" Goethe with the "fully decomposed" Byron, he gives a far more eloquent proof of constancy by studying *Meister* and *Tasso*, and completing September 26 in his *Quarrel of Bookseller and Poet* a reproduction of the *Vorspiel auf dem Theater*.

Goethe's own technique is to Pushkin an unwritten canon, a Supreme Court. "Does B. really intend to drop all that is light and gay in poetry? Where will remain satire? One will have to do away with *Orlando*, *Fuchs*! A bit rigid!" (Mich. Jan. 25, 1825.)

Already a new problem attracts the poet: the relation between critic and creative artist. In Russia, he complains, there is none. Its journalists discuss "telescope and telegraph" sprinkling them with a few dates. Crude and unbending is as yet their tool, the word. In France criticism is controlled by ignoramuses, and the *belles Lettres*, by bores. Byron and Scott substitute diffuseness for principle. Only one country has hit upon the proper balance in extending unreserved authority to Lessing and Herder.

From here Pushkin passes to yet another preoccupation: the stage. Two conditions are singled out as the *sine qua non* of tragedy: "la vraisemblance des passions"—Shakespeare, and "la vérité du costume et du dialogue"—Goethe. The formula is tried in *Boris*. We know the outcome: the poet applauds himself and hurls: "Hurrah, Pushkin, you nom d'un chien!" The only cloud to mar the beatitude is the need of an instant translation into the tongue of Goethe. The French or Russians need not count. "They will find allusions to the Warsaw revolt, and say: but pray."

Next there stretches before Pushkin's eyes the dazzling panorama of Russian history in the making. Out of hazy Novgorod and Kiev, with half-legendary Mstislav, Olga, and Sofia, he reconstructs, led on by Herder and Goethe to Karamsin and the *Letopisi*, a whole chain of causes and events. Nationality, preaches Pushkin, is as illusive as air. It feeds on climate, creed, way of living (*Notes on Reading*, 1825).

1826 brings echoes from the *West-Ostlicher Divan*. The objectivity of Goethe's orientalism is found superior to that of the English who mimick the east, while in the *Mob*, with its spokesman, a high priest of *l'art pour l'art*, Pushkin dresses his thesis in Goethe's metaphor the poet is not a streetpaver. The phenomenon reoccurs in the gripping *Stingy Knight*. It draws heavily on *Scherz, Lust, und Rache* not only for interpretation and treatment, but for the meter. The blank verse of the placid episodes pulsates with breathless rhythm in the impassioned climax.

Curiously, the date of the most important work can be only approximated. "Goethe's *Faust* is the greatest creation of poetic fancy, . . . a summary as complete of the new era, as the *Iliad* of classic antiquity" (*On Byron*, 1827). Simultaneously, Pushkin informs Pogodin. "Victory, victory, *Faust* is accepted, all but two lines!" (Scratched out by the Tzar.) Here the Goethecult reaches its apogee. A past master of all form, his every gesture is watched, says Pushkin, by the entire literary world. Repeatedly Byron had tried to emulate *Faust*, in turn caricaturing and ennobling him, but in "the duel with the Goliath of Romanticism, he became invariably lame as Jacob."

Strangely, the extensive references to Goethe die out after 1828. The long planned periodical consumes all of Pushkin's energy. "Our Journal, the first and only in Holy Russia, must appear next year. We must justify the approbation of the great Goethe . . . our patriarch."

The comprehensiveness of Pushkin's reading tells now in an unprecedented richness of content and style. Herder dictates the dénouement of *Onegin*; Jean Paul—the *Lady Peasant*; Kant, Lessing, and "that despicable pedant" Gottsched—the *Article on the Drama*. A chance line in a German review fructifies into *Mozart and Salieri*. Prophetic of Pushkin's own fate, but inspired by E. T. A. Hoffmann, is the gruesome *Queen of Spades*, its harassed protagonist but another variant of *Faust*. Research into

Hans Sachs, Goethe's model, serves to enhance Pushkin's awe before the "oldest, wisest satire" of all ages. Just two more casual allusions in 1836 "*Faust* fills me with ecstasy, but there are times when I prefer an epigram," and "the rhetoric of desperation beloved by Goethe and frowned upon by critics, is about to lose general favor." However, death alone cuts the chord. It is yet Alexander Sergeievich who encourages and directs the first Russian translation of *Faust* that of Eduard Huber.

Even if one were to disregard all evidence advanced by Smirnova's *Memours*, there can be no doubt that the reluctance with which Sasha had faced German had long since yielded to undisguised admiration. His last letters underscore this change. To his wife he lauds, now ironically, more often censoriously, Teutonic wisdom, ambition, clarity, and thoughtfulness (Sept. 1833). To be German means to be intellectually honest, and unselfishly devoted to science (March 13, 1831). Unaided, Pushkin makes an abstract of the German history of his ancestor, Abram Hannibal. In coach and diligence he eagerly seizes the opportunity to converse in German, feigning ignorance only when confronted by a five-headed Hydra "in yellow jackets and black veils." Repeatedly, he laments that entire hordes of German treasures still await the magical hand of Katenin and Jukovsky.

There can be even less doubt that Goethe strongly colored Pushkin's literary course. Certainly, the roads traversed by both are strikingly alike. As youths both feed on Anacreonism, even though Pushkin's diet calls for more minute doses of Wieland, than of Berni, Grasse, Voltaire. Also, he is more "aufgeknopft" than the suave *Geheimrat*. What Herder, von Klettenberg, and Merck do for Goethe, Byron and the selfsame Herder do for Pushkin. Goethe's sentence in behalf of his folk-poetry: "Nicht ich schuf meine Gedichte · meine Gedichte schufen mich," is applicable to the *Songs of the West Slavs*. If Goethe graduates from the apprenticeship of Sachs to that of Shakespeare, from *Ich* poetry to classicism, from idyll to aesthetics, history, and statesmanship, Pushkin inverts solely the order of the first process. True, Goethe's vacillation between being and becoming is translated by the Russian into a more pointed arch: he scales the whole gamut between spiritual wonder and debauchery.

A like bravado pervades Pushkin's religious utterance. Perhaps he is no more deaf to the God within than Goethe. Many a lofty

image in the *Lyrics* owes its lifeblood to the irreconcilable dualism of body and soul. Yet so unwavering is the emphasis on the broadest emancipation, that, lifting the veil from pretense and sham, Pushkin grows abusively, relentlessly gross. Eucharistic rites are valued lower than good wine. It gives the poet a sadistic thrill to humiliate the most bigoted of church elders. No blockhead and boor plays the fool as uniformly as the priest. It would almost seem that the reserve, upheld as the unerring earmark of genius, forsakes him alone here.

Uncompromising, relentless is Alexander Sergeievich's insistence on freedom. Liberty is tantamount to genius. He gets involved in freemasonry and the December riots. Always he champions the cause of the underdog. Greece, Serbia, Italy, no matter what the cost. Nothing can equal in his eyes the degradation of slavery, and nothing brings forth such fireworks of fury and hatred as native censorship. From the *First Message* down to the late *Essays on Style and Education* the leitmotive is the stupid cowardice of the bureaucrat, this squalid insect, which Pushkin is ready to stab with the deadliest weapon, that of Goethesque creative thought (*On Daring*, 1828). A noble, and proud of a family rooted deeper than the Romanovs, he is more than Goethe a son of the people.

An adherent of naturalism (*On Reading*, 1825), Pushkin nevertheless refuses to subscribe to the apotheosis of the peasant with its war on intellect. Weakness upon weakness is piled on his rural heroes, undependable, cruel, bloodthirsty. The touching epistles to his nurse are, of course, in a class apart. True, the sporadic lust for country air and peace, the fervid adulation of the sea return with a tragic undertone after his wedding, but Pushkin would have rebelled against the isolation of Goethe's retreat. His realm is the salon, epigram, gossip, obscenity.

In expressing their feelings Pushkin's characters are unrestrained. Passion is synonymous with perfectability. If Germany had to its credit a single feat, the freeing of Russia from Gallic shackles, it has amply justified its existence, asserts the poet. Inspiration is sublime, as "indispensable in geometry as in poetry." "Each line must mirror a poet's soul, each artist be judged by his own principles" (*Inspiration and Delight*, 1824, Lett. Jan. 1825), and "a savant without genius reminds one of a mule, who, anxious to fill himself with the spirit of Mahomet, cuts up the Koran. and

swallows it" (1825). Hardly on a plane with Goethe as a life-builder, Pushkin raises Schelling's doctrine of the sanctity of a poet's vocation to a Magna Carta of freedom. The aim of poetry is poetry, an artist is above progress, time, rule (*Essays*, 1825-31).

Pushkin lives the theory. As a man he is harassed, brusque, vulgar, but the poet achieves a sunny calm, alongside of which even Goethe's wisdom is stilted and artificial. On the eve of new "isms" Schopenhauer, Baudelaire, Maeterlinck, Pushkin keeps and bestows to the world Goethe's Hellenic dignity.

LUBOV KEEFER

The Johns Hopkins University

A LEXICOGRAPHIC MIRAGE

Among the shortcomings of dictionaries about which not only philologists, but also cultivated laymen are often heard complain, there is one that may well deserve a short discussion: the inclusion, by lexicographers, of non-existent words. We shall attempt to illustrate this assertion by a consideration of one of the most elaborate works that is consulted at present: the new Historical Dictionary of the Spanish Academy.¹

As it is helpful, in such cases, to focus upon a single particularly symptomatic question, we may ask: what are the criteria that should guide a lexicographer in determining whether a given form of the type *aventajado*, *avinagrado* should be accepted as participial or adjectival in nature?

On the one hand, there are nominative verbs in Spanish of the type *aconsejar*, *aflojar*, on which are formed the regular participles *aconsejado*, *aflojado*. On the other hand, adjectives expressing resemblance are immediately derived from nouns and bear the same form as the participles: *afrancesado*, *anaranjado*; ² no verbs *afrancesar*, *anaranjar* have ever existed.

¹ *Diccionario Histórico de la Lengua española*, Madrid, Academia Española, 2 vol., 1933-36 (A-Ce)

² Historically, they can be traced back to two sources a) the participle of "aconsejado" could be directly referred to "consejo" so as to eliminate the intermediate verb, and new adjectives of the same structure could be drawn from any noun; b) the Latin type *caudatus*, *coronatus*, *dentatus*

There are dubious cases, where, at first glance, the words ending in *-ado* can come either from the verb or from the noun: *azucarado-azúcar-azucarar*.³ If the verb really exists, it does not necessarily represent the point of departure. It may have been developed after the adjective, which subsequently assumed the value of a participle and thus prepared the way for the verb. But the very existence of the verb may be problematic. Often, where a verb derived from a noun is listed, observation reveals that its only form in actual use is the supposed past participle. Now, the question arises as to whether the word is not a simple adjective, derived directly from the noun. If this is so, the supposed verb does not exist at all. Conversely, we sometimes meet with a fictitious adjective, concealing the only current form of a verb.

As the form alone does not permit any classification of the character of the words, we must establish some other principles that may help us to differentiate the two values. Before entering into the details, however, it is useful to state the reasons for these ambiguities.

Among the nominative verbs,⁴ the group which denotes actions affecting an object is of major importance for the study of past participles, since this type implies a very intense activity, concentrated on causing the object to assume a certain quality. However, an act of transformation is rarely accessible to direct observation in every day life. If it takes but a few moments, it will be overlooked, and if it covers a long period, its very slowness may make it imperceptible. What is usually encountered, is not the action as it is carried out, but the consequences of the consummated event. We seldom witness the process by which a watch is gilded or silvered, unless we choose to go to the craftsman's shop. But all of us have seen gilded and silvered watches, in which the original action has dwindled to the point of denoting a mere quality based on its effect. Grammatically speaking, these words are usually

could easily assume an additional *a-* owing to the mobility of this element in a great many Old Castilian words (*a*)*juntar*, (*a*)*temer*—(*a*)*tan*, (*a*)*tamaño*—(*a*)*cedrez*, (*a*)*tambor*.

³ It is true that the Dictionary lists as adjectives not only such as have been derived from nouns, but also participles that have lost their original verbal substance. These two categories should be strictly kept asunder in the historical perspective of the language.

⁴ Carl S. R. Collin, *Étude sur le développement de sens du suffixe -ata*, Lund (1918), pp. 132-141 and *passim*.

employed but in one form, namely the past participle. They are to a certain extent defective, and this kind of syntactic defectiveness should be noted no less than the one which is so profusely treated in morphology.

This is the reason why so many words of the "*avinagrado*" type have easily passed from the verbal to the nominative function. Since the characteristic inflexional forms of the verbs occur only rarely, they have simply been shaken off, and association with their nominal stems ("gold, silver") has led to the formation of analogous words on the same pattern, directly derived from the nouns.

Thus, "*temblar como un azogado*" seems to have been used from the fifteenth century onward. We run across similar collocations in *Celestina* and in *Romances Viejos* as well as in the works of various classical and modern authors. With such a vast number of examples available, one feels inclined to term "*azogado*" a simple adjective, substantivized like the forms for most diseases. Well-grounded as this conclusion might appear, it is quite wrong. J. Acosta chanced to write in his *Historia Natural de las Indias* "*Las personas que destapan las ollas se azogan y mueren.*" So *azogarse* must have existed as a real verb. But, were it not for this single instance of a finite form, we most probably could not be sure of its existence.

In many cases, the chronological facts suffice to clarify the question of priority. *Azulado* was derived from *azul* at the time when the adjectival type was at its highest (1600-1650) on the pattern of *agamuzado*, *amorado*. *Azular* did not exist at all in the Golden Age. It is a beautiful innovation introduced as late as the time of Zorrilla: "*los cóncavos espacios que el arre diáfano azula*" Originally, the corresponding verb had been *azulear* (like *blanquear*, *negrear*).

Agigantado, used by Ovalle (1646), belongs to the *abizcayado*, *ajudado*, *amulatado* group, occurring, above all, in the picaresque novels. *Agigantarse* did not come into existence until after Bello extracted it, so to speak, from the former adjective, interpreting this adjective as a participle. The gap of two centuries between the development of the two functions leaves no doubt as to how noun, verb and adjective are tied together. Nor do we have any hesitation in declaring that *avillanar* (Cervantes) is based on *avillanado* (already familiar to Juan del Encina and Lucas Fernández), which, in its turn, is derived from *villano*.

But there are certain limits to the reliability of dates. When the difference of time is no greater than a few decades, we should abstain from resorting to this criterion in view of the incompleteness of our dictionaries. Furthermore, there often remains the possibility of two spontaneous, independent attempts to enrich the vocabulary. In these cases, we must deal with syntactic criteria.

There is one particular shade of meaning which we can hardly apprehend unless we associate it with a pre-existent verb, and that is the instrumental function of the noun included in the stem of the respective formations. The very idea of a means or a motive force instantly suggests or even is preceded by, the idea of an action. This does not imply that the verb previously existed in what we used to call the common speech. A germ, a vague presentiment of it might have appeared in the mind of the author just before he wrote down the form in *-ado* (which thus turns out to be a participle), and then have vanished. At any rate, its very creator could not have attained the form without passing through a certain verbal zone. This momentary, unshapen verbal idea, dimly emerging in the mind of a single individual, deserves study and listing in a scientific dictionary as representative of a real verb. Let us see, whether the Dictionary does not sometimes sin against that important principle:

1. *basquiña de tafetán pardo, atorzalada con oro* (*Libros de Caballerías*),
2. *andan por las calles danzando como atarantados* (*Mármol, Descripción de África*),
3. *alabardas ataujadas de oro y plata* (*Maldonado, Peregr. de F. M. Pinto*),
4. *el aveninado por tóxico* (*A. de Palencia*);
5. *el teatro anubado con buen ayre* (*Villarroel*);
6. *alacranado = picado, inficionado por un alacrán*

All these words are looked upon as adjectives by the compilers of the Dictionary. Yet why not suppose the (however transitory) existence of such verbs as *atorzalar*, *atarantar*, *ataujar*, *aveninar*, *anubar*, *alacranar*?

It is under these headings that the instances should be entered. What makes us feel the verbal substance is the statement of the acting force, made either implicitly (*atarantado*, viz *por la tarántula*), or explicitly. In the latter case, either a tautology may be involved (*aveninados por tóxico*) or a closer specification (*atorzalado con oro*). If this condition is suppressed, there is no longer

any need of raising to the level of a verb what can be explained as an ordinary, motionless adjective.

But here again, the Historical Dictionary lacks consistency to a deplorable extent. It calls *azafranado* an adjective in "*color azafranado*" (B. Casas), "*tocas azafranadas*" (Castillejo), "*tocados azafranados*" (Villalón). For some incomprehensible reason, however, it attributes "*vestidas de una ropa azafranada*" (B. Casas) to the verbal domain. So far as can be conjectured from the context, the hue rather than the process of dying was viewed by the author. Similarly, in the case of "*azúcar y canela y otras especies finas, azafranadas*" (Nola, *Libro de Cocina*), mere resemblance of flavor seems to be alluded to, and in no wise the action of spicing.

The classification is likewise arbitrary with regard to *avinagrado*. In the example "*el pan que es duro, o avinagrado, o mal cocho*" (Guevara), we are told that the word is a verb, and in the group "*esta que acá tenéis por avinagrada*" (Villalón), it is declared an adjective, and it is treated as such, when metaphorically used.

These latter cases are complicated, because *avinagrar* and *azafranar* do exist in reality as *verba finita*, and though the explicit mention of an instrument undoubtedly implies the verbal nature of the word, the rule does not lend itself to inversion. Even though it is not specified, the idea of an instrument may have faintly or distinctly been present in the author's mind, and this is a psychologic condition which is beyond our realm of knowledge. We must therefore confine ourselves to a statement of the greater probability. In the absence of clear evidence, we must regard a case as adjectival, if many unquestionably nominative formations sprang up in its time, which may have tempted the author to contribute toward this vogue. This is actually the case with the Golden Age, to which we owe many hundreds of such formations: *abrasilado*, *ahigadado*, *alagartado*, *ametallado*, *amoriscado*—*adamado*, *ahembrado*, *alacayado*, *amujerado*, *aniñado*—*adinorado*, *ahacendado*, *aposesionado*, *arrendado*—*aburrado*, *acaballado*, *acamellado*, *apapagayado*—*abigotado*, *amostachado*, *ajuanetado*, etc. A more accurate analysis should, moreover, pay attention to the frequency of the formation in the particular literary species, the personal style of the writer, and other indirect evidence.

But there are cases where the Dictionary postulates verbs that never have, nor could have existed at all. To speak of a verb in the case of "*cada libra de cáñamo asedado*" (*Cédula Real de Alquileres*

y precios, 1642), when countless words exist of the type of *alesnado*, *abellotado*, *aterciopelado*, *acambrayado*, *atafetanado*, *atisuado*, *agrisetado*, *adamascado* (all of them obviously expressing mere resemblance, and none of them accompanied by verbs) can only be styled a lexicographic mirage!

The second internal criterion is the degree of semantic vicinity. If the logical tie between the noun and the supposed adjective is a very complex one, there is always a valid reason for suspecting the agency of an intermediate verb. For the verb, expressing motion in itself, is more subject to a shifting of its original sense than is the fixed noun.

Are we entitled to list *azurronarse* as an independent verb? Its free use is nowhere attested, the only extant form being the past participle *ojuelos azurronados* (Quevedo); *manzana azurronada* (Abu Zacarías), *becerruca azurronada* (Pereda). The only reasonable translation of this is "resembling an ear enclosed in a "zurrón". The relation between the stem and the derivation comprises a local element and an idea of similarity. It is so intricate, and the distance between the point of comparison and the object referred to is so considerable that the existence of a verb is made rather plausible. In this case, we fully agree with the decision of the Dictionary.

A further symptom of an intermediate verbal zone occurs when the resemblance does not refer to a striking quality of the object in the state of repose (except, when the phenomena are only perceptible in movement, such as the storm and the lightning, and immediately suggest adjectives involving the same dynamic idea).

For example, *azogado* among its multiplied significations has adopted the meaning "*turbado, desalentado*" *cuan azogada y colérica venía su letra* (Guevara). A true adjective *azogado* would have designated the calm surface of mercury, as in Oviedo's collocation: "*perlas . . . de color como azogado*." But, as the preacher was comparing a nervous handwriting to the mobility of quicksilver, the interference of a verb is made highly probable. Fortunately, our factual knowledge confirms this assumption: *azogáronse las plantas* (Quevedo); *azogándose las piernas* (Estebanillo).

This is equally true with regard to *avellanado*, as used by Cervantes: "*un hombre alto de cuerpo, seco de rostro, estrado y avellanado de miembros*", "*la historia de un hijo seco avellanado*." The prevalent idea is not the shape (size, color, weight) of the hazel-nut, but the shriveling, particularly noticeable in a hazel-nut. Lope de

Vega wrote "*después que una persona se avellana*," which supports our assumption of a co-existing verb.

If scholars have so often failed to discriminate between the two derivations, it is because the very language seems to baffle their endeavors and to take pleasure in continually mixing them together.

The Spanish type of verb *a . . . ear* is very suitable for the expression of a reiterated action directed toward a certain end, such as throwing, flinging, or knocking *abofetear*, *acañaverear*, *alancear*, *apedrear*, *asaetear*. Now, if the botanist is in need of an equivalent for "arrow-like" (as related to a leaf), it is the image of the arrow in a state of repose that will work on his mind. Consequently, he should resort to **alanzado*. But the sound of the verb (perhaps, also, that of the whizzing spear) interferes, and the result is a not very satisfactory compromise *alanceado* (Cavanilla, 1802), whose *-e-* implies the rather inopportune ideas of movement and repetition. Fortunately this form has meanwhile given way to a learned, but, at least, correct *lanceolado*. Yet a perfectly similar form, *asaetado*, still occurs in Colmeiro (1871), instead of **asaetado* or **sagitado*, which would be the only ones acceptable.

The second example takes us back to an earlier stage of the language. In a very belated recast of the *General Chronicle* (1541), we meet with "*como estaban los siete Infantes asaborados en un juego*." The term in question is interpreted as an adjective, and it looks like a derivation from *sabor*. On the other hand, *asaborar* was not unknown to Villena, and, on closer inspection, the whole sentence seems to hinge on *estaban asaborados* as its verb (= they enjoyed a game). Now, the oldest version of the *Chronicle*, written in the thirteenth century, contains a similar group in a different context: *el Qid . . . et el obispo . . . estaban muy asaborgados*. But here, the *-g-* is an unmistakable evidence that the word descended from a Latin formation in *-icare*, and the trustworthiness of this passage is corroborated by another, from L. Ayala. Now, in the fifteenth and, occasionally, in the sixteenth centuries, adjectives of the *avmagrado* type were derived (in contrast to our own habit) from abstract nouns. *Agraciado* (Santillana), *apasionado* (Celestina), *aquerenciado* (*Cancionero de Encina*), *adolorado* (Cibdarrreal), *ahervorado* (Cabrera) precede the respective verbs (if there are any) by some decades. So we are safe in assuming that the transition from the transparent *asaborgado* to the dubious *asaborado* is due to the interference of such formations. Preference was

given the verbal form that seemed to bring the word into direct contact with the noun *sabor*. Were it not for the old example casually preserved, we could have been misled by the form and should have looked on *asaborado* as of nominative origin. (Comparison of the sister languages: Fr. *savourer*, Ital. *assaporare*, could as well protect us from error).

We have tried to give here no more than a preparatory survey of what remains to be done. There are reasons enough that tentatively urge us to elucidate even the most intricate cases.

The lexicographer would not be the only one to profit by this inquiry. The grammarian demands information on the exact boundary between inflexion and word-formation. His must be the attempt to trace the transition from the nominal to the verbal domain with utmost accuracy. Furthermore, he is confronted with the delicate new questions of "syntactic defectiveness" and "the interlying verbal zone."

Students of literature and style will be primarily concerned with the clarification of the extent to which genuine creation (or derivation) of a new lexical unit can be separated from a mechanical application of already exploited word material. If there seems to be something striking about *aconejado*, *andiado*, *ajesuntado*, *asocarronado*, *asochantrado*, it is due to their freshness and originality and to the surprising effect which occurs, when ordinary adjectives are disguised as verbs. We have a right to inquire whether *asedado*, *avellanado*, *avinagrado*, etc. produced a similar impression, or whether they were reckoned among the average, colorless, unimpressive participles.

The lexicographer himself must observe the following rules:

1. State, if a *verbum finitum* "*avinagrar*" was in use; if so, try to reconstruct the sequence of the evidence of the dates

2 In the absence of finite forms, subject "*avinagrado*" itself to a close syntactic analysis. If coupled with the idea of an instrument (a), or if loosely linked to the noun from the semantic viewpoint (b), or if resembling the noun in its state of movement rather than that of repose (c), list the forms as participles and assume the existence of a verb

3 In case the instrumental idea may have been expressed implicitly, the function thus remaining dubious, try to introduce literary criteria

4 Take into consideration similar derivations, which help to retrace the original state of things, if obscured by subsequent shiftings

Thus, there is a curious overlapping and interlocking of lexicography, grammar and style in this particular linguistic province,

and the compiler of a dictionary has no chance to do his work well, unless he pays due regard to the achievements of the neighboring disciplines.⁵

Y. MALKIEL

New York

PATHELIN

Whence came the name of the hero of the farce, *Maître Pierre Pathelin*? Petit de Julleville believed it to be an invention of the author's, but others have held that some antecedent word must have suggested it. Du Cange, followed by Littré, derived *Pathelin* from *Paterinus*, i. e. a member of a heretical sect, hence a false speaker, a flatterer. Chevaldin related the name to an earlier word meaning "language," connected somehow with the modern slang *pateln*.¹ Sainéan took it from the verb *pateler*, which Palsgrave as early as 1530 in his *Esclaircissement* (pp 484, 681) translated by "chitter, as a young bird does before she can sing her tune";² from "chirp" to "prattle" is a short step, and for Sainéan the hero's name meant simply *jaseur*. He seems originally to have derived the slang word *patelin* from the farce, assuming that it first signified "langage obscur et embrouillé, comme celui débité par maître Pathelin, terme synonyme de *baragouin*", "ensuite pays où l'on parle pateln . . . ; de là, dans le langage populaire, pays natal et compatriote."³ More recently, in his *Sources indigènes* II, 1925, p. 15, he mentions neither the play nor the meaning *baragouin* and states merely that "*pateler* s'applique

⁵ I am greatly obliged to Professor Spitzer for various suggestions and to Dr Anna Hatcher for her valuable criticism of this paper

¹ *Les Jargons de la farce de Pathelin*, 1903, pp 1 ff. Chevaldin's conclusions, plausible in the main, are inadequately supported by his philological suggestions. His examples are useful, but are presented with no regard for chronology and include several incorrect attributions.

² It should be noted, however, that Godefroy, s. v. *patiler* (gazouiller), records a much earlier example from the treatise of Gautier de Biblessworth, which must date from before 1304 (cf. Grober's *Grundriss*, 1902, II, 857).

³ These conclusions emerge from his *Langue de Rabelais* II, 1923, 378 and *Argot ancien*, 1907, 207; cf. also his *Sources de l'argot ancien* II, 1912, 412.

au gazouillement des oiseaux. De là *patelin*, synonyme de patois et de pays natal, ce dernier encore vivace dans le vulgaire parisien." This last conclusion seems to me to represent the correct chronology, but it is now necessary to find a place within its general frame for the hero of the farce and the meaning *baragouin*, and to support these hypotheses by such evidence as is available.

The whole question is complicated by the fact that the surviving examples of the word and of its derivatives, *pateliner*, *patelnage*, *patelneux*, *patelinois*, are later than the play, and that all but two or three of them must be connected directly with the play itself. This is true, for instance, of the earliest datable example, which occurs in a *charte de rémission* signed by King Louis XI at Tours shortly before Easter in the year 1470 (new style),⁴ where the word in its context (*pateliner et faire du malade*) can refer only to the farce. It is also true of another datable example, seemingly not cited before in this connection, that appears in one of Menot's macaronic sermons delivered at Tours in 1508 "Domini ecclesiastici et mercatores, gustastisne . . . quid est ludere *du pateln et du beau beau*?"⁵ It is likewise true of all but one of the examples of *pateln* and its derivatives in Rabelais, of two in Coquillart's works, and of various later instances that might be cited.

In most of the examples just mentioned (the *charte de rémission*, Menot's sermon, *Pantagruel* II, 30 and III, 34), the words connote deceit and derive from the hero's character or from the plot of the play. Coquillart (1450-1510) in his *Dronts nouveaux* (ed. Héricault, I, 86) probably uses the verb *pateliner* with the more specific meaning of "to deceive by flattery, to flatter" "Elle [la bourgeoisie de basse lignie] a sa couple de chevaulx / Après surviennent fringuereaulx / Dancer, joncher, patheliner" This meaning is also found in Robert Estienne's *Dictionnaire françois-latin* (1549, repeated in that of 1573) where *pateline* is glossed by "palpatur" with the example, "Comment il pateline ceste femme! Quam blande mulieri palpatur!" By Cotgrave's time the word had come to mean "a cogger, colloquer, flatterer, soother, smotherer;

⁴ *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, 1847-48, 258-60 The document is dated according to the old style "ou moys d'avril, avant Pasques, l'an de grace mil cccc soixante et neuf" Easter occurred on April 22 in 1470

⁵ "Sermons choisis de Michel Menot," ed J Nève, *Bibl du xve siècle*, t. XXX, 1924, p. 17. Oudin, s. v. *beau beau (faire)* glosses "flatter en apparence, faire caresse et trahir en derrière"

a cousener; a pratler or fond dallier; also, a Buffoon, or Vice in a play." See, too Cotgrave's definitions of *patelnage* and *pateliner*.

In some of our examples, however, the word seems to be more directly connected with Pathelin's use of "divers langages." Thus when, in *Pantagruel* II, 9, Epistemon asks Panurge, "Parlez vous christian, mon amy, ou langage patelinois?", the reference is obviously to the scene in the farce where Pathelin, like Panurge, uses various foreign tongues. Rabelais employs the word similarly in his letter to Antoine Hullet when he quotes from Pathelin's trade in Latin and pretends to translate it from "patelinois" into "vulgaire orléanois." In both cases the reference is to the language of Pathelin.

Occasionally the concepts of deceit and language are combined. This is evident in Coquillart's *Monologue des Perruques* (ed. Héricault II, 292). "Les ungz par leur fin jobelin / Fournissent à l'apointement; / Les aultres par leur pathelin / D'un *cedo bonis* nettement." The meaning "crafty language" also appears in the questions and answers of the farce of *Messieurs de Mallepays et de Baillevant* (ed. E. Fournier, *Théâtre franç. avant la Renaissance*, p. 118). "Et aux rustes?" "Le jobelin." / "Aux mignons de court?" "L'accollée." / "Aux gens de mesmes?" "La risée." / "Et aux ouvriers?" "Le pathelin." Note the use of *leur* and *le* in these two instances. The same dual implication is present in *Pantagruel* III, 22: "O quel patelneux!" which Urquhart and Motteux translate by "O the cozening pratler that he is!"⁶ and in the *Farce de Calbain* (ed. Fournier, *op. cit.*, 280): "Vous sçavez bien pateliner, / Mais, pour mieulx l'enjobelner, / Dictes-luy ce qu'il ne fut onc."

All these examples show that, whether or not the word existed before the farce, its later meanings were surely influenced by Maître Pierre. In two or three instances, however, no such influence need be posited. The earliest of these occurs in a text held to be practically contemporaneous with the farce, the *Faintes du Monde* by Guillaume Alexis.⁷ Stanza 108 reads (ed. S. A. T. F., I, 118):

⁶ Sainéan's interpretation, "insinuant et trompeur comme Pathelin," does not quite indicate that it is Raminagrobis' equivocal phrases which are in question.

⁷ The editors, Piaget and Picot, date the *Faintes* "vers 1460." Cons would put it about the same time as *Pathelin*, for which he accepts Holbrook's date, 1464 ("L'Auteur de la farce de *Pathelin*," *Elliott Monographs* 17, 1926, p. 111).

Tel sçait bien faire une maison
 Qui ne sçait pas faire ung moulin,
 Tel a largement de blason
 Qui ne sçait pas son patelin, 860
 Tel a souvent bonne raison
 Qui ne la sçait bouter en termes,
 Tel cueult des biens en la saison
 Qu'il gardera pour les gens d'armes

(In lines 859-860 two prints and one late manuscript read. Tel a l'argent par beau blason / Qui n'entend pas son patelin. This late reading, however, is not supported by the twenty-three other manuscripts and prints that survive, and the editors rightly reject it.) Some seven possible interpretations of lines 859-860 have been suggested by Cons and Holbrook—who of course believe Alexis (or Alecis) to have been the author of the play—and in each of these interpretations it is assumed that the word *patelin* refers either to the title of the farce or to the character of its hero.⁸ But the stanzas of the *Faintes du Monde* are usually fairly unified in spirit, and in any case we should expect the antithesis introduced in the midst of this one to be similar to the rest. The other lines may be translated somewhat as follows “He knows how to build a house who cannot build a mill, . . . he often has a good cause who cannot put it into words, he gathers wealth at times who cannot keep it (who will keep it for the soldiery, i. e. be robbed of it).” In every instance the supposition is that a man who is competent in one respect may be incompetent in another. Somehow it seems to introduce an over-subtle note, as well as a unique gloss of the words *son patelin* to interpret lines 859-860 as: “Tel a beaucoup de réputation ou, comme nous disons aujourd'hui, de ‘réclame’ qui n'est pas cependant très malin, qui connaît mal les finesses, la cautèle qu'il prétend pratiquer.” Even more difficult, in the midst of the other antitheses, is a second interpretation: “Tel a largement de crédit, si on ne sait pas son ‘pathelin,’” i. e. the farce, “ce *Pathelin* qui est de lui”⁹ I find it easier, more consonant with

⁸ Summarized by R. T. Holbrook, “Guillaume Alecis et Pathelin,” *Univ. of California Publ. in Mod. Phil.* XIII, 1928, pp. 384 ff. (= separate reprint, pp. 100 ff.)

⁹ L. Cons, *op. cit.*, p. 129. Holbrook rings various minor and unconvincing changes on these two conceptions. Needless to say, if the word was known before the play was written, one of the strongest links between the farce and the works of Alecis is considerably weakened.

the rest of the stanza and with the meaning of the word found elsewhere, to believe that *patelin* here signifies simply *langage*, and to translate "he has a great talent for talking" ¹⁰ who cannot speak his own tongue, who does not know his native speech."

A second instance of the word in this meaning occurs in *Le Testament Pathelin*, a farce of uncertain date, but written not later than ca. 1505 when it was first printed, and probably somewhat earlier.¹¹ Pathelin, now an old man, is giving directions for his epitaph (p. 206) ·

Puis, faictes faire en lettre jaulne,
Dessus moy, en beau pathelin ·
Cy repose et gist Pathelin,
En son temps avocat sous l'orme,
Conseiller de M de Corne,
Et de damoiselle sa femme
Priez Dieu que il ait son âme!

The editor, Jacob, interpreted the first *pathelin* as meaning "en style pathelinois, en langage de Pathelin," but, although there is humor in the lines, there is nothing crafty, flattering, obscure or otherwise pathelinesque about the epitaph, the word rhymes with Pathelin itself, and I see no reason to define it otherwise than by *langage*.

A third example is less certain. The word obviously means "language," but whether this language is "obscur et embrouillé," as Sainéan believes (*Langue de Rabelais* II, 378), must be left to the reader. It occurs in *Pantagruel* V, 27. "Durant la procession [des frères Fredone], ils fredonnoient entre les dens melodieusement ne scay quelles antiphones, car je n'entendois leur patelin: et ententivement escoutant, apperceu qu'ils ne chantoient que des

¹⁰ For this translation of *blason*, see the many examples in Godefroy and Huguet where the word means *discours*, *explication*, *conversation*, *propos* and, as Bos suggests (*Glossaire de la langue d'oïl*), *bagou*. Note especially the example with *avoir* from Viollet le Duc's *Ancien Théâtre fr* I, 269. "Ha, que ce fol a de blason!" Cf also *Pathelin* 456-57 and Alecis' *Blason de Faulses Amours*, 518. Though the translation "réputation, réclame" is not impossible, "gift of gab" seems more nearly to represent the idea. In any case, whichever interpretation of *blason* one prefers, the meaning of *son patelin* is not affected.

¹¹ Printed by P. L. Jacob (Paul Lacroix), *Recueil de Farces*, 1876, 179 ff. On the date, see Brunet, *Manuel du libraire* IV, 434 and Picot' introduction to "Maistre Pierre Pathelin hystorié," S. A. T. F., 1904, pp. 9-10.

oreilles. . . ." Since Rabelais knew the farce well, he may have had some aspect of it in mind, but the word needs no other gloss than *langage*

In view of the last three examples, therefore, I am inclined to believe that the form *patelín*, meaning speech or native speech, was in existence before the farce was written, that the choice of the hero's name was influenced by his prowess as a speaker and by his use of *divers langages* (cf. the other figurative names in the play: Aignelet, Esservellé, Martin Garant, Peu-d'Aquest) and that the later meanings, "crafty language," and "gibberish," which the word assumed after the farce had become popular, were facilitated by the fact that before it had been composed *patelín* already signified *langage*.¹²

GRACE FRANK

Bryn Mawr College

JAKOB WASSERMANN'S *LUKARDIS*

The drama and the "novelle" have frequently been regarded as somewhat akin in unity, compactness of structure, and rather limited scope. Consequently it is of interest to compare the treatment of the same subject matter and motif in these two literary forms by Jakob Wassermann. Both works are entitled *Lukardis*.

¹² The slang meaning of *patelín* (spelled *paquelín*), "pays natal," is attested from 1628, but how much earlier it may have been current we do not know. It may be worth noting that two early editions of the farce bear the title "Maistre Pierre Pathelin et son jargon," and that two others spell the name "Pachelin." Although Saméan considers *patelín* a synonym of *patois*, he does not connect them, ascribing to the latter a popular origin (*Sources indigènes* I, 220-222). Prof. Spitzer kindly calls my attention to the parallelism existing between the facetious formations with the suffixes *-in* and *-ois* in words like *patelín*, *blesquin*, *jobelín*, etc. (modelled on *latin*) and *patois*, *patelinois*, *narquois*, *lanternois*, etc. (modelled on *français*, *anglais*, etc.), and he suggests that "c'il oiselet" who sang "en loi latin" (cf. Godefroy, s. v. *latin*) may well have influenced the formation of *patelín* from *patiler*, *pateller*. He also points out the semantic affinities between the development of *patelín* and *patois*, both of which, from meaning "langage particulier," came to signify "pays" and even, by extension, "compatriots." On *patois* with these meanings see *Courrier de Vaugelas* VIII, 85 and Godefroy, for bibliography see *R. E. W.* 3 6301.

The "novelle" appeared in 1920,¹ the drama was published twelve years later.² Wassermann's wife states that the play was staged in Vienna in 1933, and that the dramatization of the "novelle" was undertaken as a study in dialogue.³ It is significant that at one time Wassermann's friend Moritz Heimann, reader for the publishing house of S. Fischer which published most of his works, urged the novelist to write "novellen" and a drama as an aid to formal, structural discipline.⁴

The plot of *Lukardis* centers about two characters, the young Russian officer Nadinsky and Lukardis, an innocent girl of eighteen or nineteen, who has led a sheltered life in aristocratic surroundings, and is engaged to Kussin, a high official, for whom she has no warm attachment. In the heat of battle Nadinsky suddenly abandons his company, joins the Moscow revolutionaries, is severely wounded, transported from one hiding-place to another, and finally brought to a *maison de rendezvous* in the hope that there he may remain undiscovered for two days and recover sufficiently to make his escape from Russia. Anastasia Karlowna, a sympathetic woman of middle age, who nurses the wounded officer and becomes interested in rescuing him, prevails upon Lukardis to pose as Nadinsky's mistress in this house which seems to be the one place where no papers of identity will be demanded. The two youthful idealists had never met before. Their situation is singular, the dissimulation which they must practice to escape detection is trying, they fall in love, and separate after two days of harrowing suspense, never to meet again. Yet they part with the conviction that, though this brief meeting is final, true love can triumph over time and space.

The "novelle" *Lukardis* is brief and unified. There are no episodes, the structure is compact, and the action progresses rapidly. The terse exposition is followed by narration of events in chronological sequence. There is but little dialogue, for in the interest of brevity Wassermann employed considerable indirect discourse which is concise and condensed. He resorted to direct discourse in a few tense situations and for more incisive characterization. The style is

¹ Included in *Der Wendekreis*. Erste Folge. Berlin, S. Fischer, 1920, pp 169-200

² *Lukardis Schauspiel in drei Akten* Berlin, S. Fischer, 1932

³ Karlweis, Marta. *Jakob Wassermann* Amsterdam, Querido, 1935, p 457.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 178.

direct, lucid and free from mannerisms, the diction is simple and concrete, the story is told with the greatest objectivity. It is in conformity with Goethe's definition of the "novelle" as "eine sich ereignete unerhorte Begebenheit"; in singularity of theme, conciseness, objectivity, condensed indirect discourse, restricted use of dialogue, use of expressive gestures, and rapid progression of unified action it reveals the influence of Wassermann's study of Kleist's narratives.⁵

In dramatizing the "novelle" Wassermann enlarged its scope, added several characters, portrayed other personages such as Anastasia and Igor in sharper relief, made changes of scene, omitted certain details, added others, heightened suspense, and introduced an inner conflict of importance. Although each of the three acts contains considerable material not found in the narrative, the second act presents the greatest departure. Here the scene shifts from the room occupied by Nadinsky and Lukardis to the abode of the revolutionary Krasnucha and again to Kussin's bureau. Much of the intrigue of Krasnucha and his accomplices has no bearing on the destiny of the two principal characters. These additions and changes were probably introduced because Wassermann felt that the range of his "novelle" was too limited for even a brief drama. The result is a change of emphasis, a certain loss of unity, and a shifting of interest from the surging rush of emotions precipitated by the strange situation into which Nadinsky and Lukardis were thrown so suddenly. On the other hand, some scenes of the drama, notably those in which the principal characters appear, gain in intensity, tension and suspense. In the drama relief from suspense is provided by the introduction of characters with emphasis upon the revolution, in the narrative it is induced quite unobtrusively by fatigue and sleep on the part of the young pair. Because of its greater unity, the "novelle" provides more sustained interest.

The brief exposition, with which the "novelle" opens, arouses and holds interest. The presentation of antecedent events is so closely linked up with the story proper as to make the transition almost imperceptible. Since the plot may well be said to begin when Nadinsky joins the revolutionaries, the exposition is thus limited to a terse statement of the time, the place, and the circumstances which led to his sudden, impulsive desertion.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 345.

In the drama the sequence of exposition and action is quite different, due in part to the greater detail with which antecedent events are presented. For it is only in the fourth scene, after Anastasia Karlowna has under false pretexts engaged an apartment in the *maison de rendezvous* for Nadinsky, that a commissar begins the exposition by supplying the mistress of the house with information about the young officer's desertion. The remainder of the expository material is likewise interwoven with the action, most of it being given bit by bit throughout the greater part of the first act. Additional information about the stratagem evolved by Lukardis to cloak her disappearance from home, no details of which are to be found in the "novelle," is revealed in the second act. This ruse subsequently assumes greater importance when its discovery by Kussin threatens to prevent Nadinsky's escape. The last statement of antecedent events appears in the third act; it explains vividly the impulses which led to Lukardis' decision to aid in the rescue of Nadinsky. Nadinsky's motives for desertion are likewise set forth in greater detail than in the "novelle." Obviously, more effective presentation of the more minute exposition in the drama required a different technique. The interweaving of exposition and action is surprisingly skillful on the part of an author with but little experience in the writing of drama. It is worthy of note that Wassermann refrained from use of the easy, hackneyed device of allowing one of the characters to recite expository details at the beginning of the play.

The characterization of the two principals is, on the whole, much the same in the two works. Yet there is greater variety and subtlety in the portrayal of their emotions in the narrative where, because of the absence of revolutionary intrigue, the emphasis lies on the gradual change in the relations of Nadinsky and Lukardis. It becomes quite obvious that the narrator has greater freedom and opportunity for careful analysis of fleeting moods, and that description is a more facile means to that end than is dialogue. On the other hand fewer moods, notably those of despondency, skepticism, inner torment, wonder and terror are brought to a sharper focus in the drama because of its tendency to exaggerate for effectiveness on the stage. In the main, passions seem more tumultuous than in the "novelle" where transitions are made more slowly. The greater sweep of the narrative with its subtler presentation contrasts with the greater intensity of fewer moods in the drama.

Nadinsky's somewhat passive, brooding, vacillating slavish temperament stands out more sharply in the drama where repeatedly he skeptically questions the motives underlying his desertion, expresses his surprise at his sudden action, and shrinks before decisions. "Der Mensch und seine Handlungen sind zweierlei Dinge. Tun, immer tun . . . das Tunmüssen ist eine ansteckende Krankheit." (p. 38). In the last act he comes to a realization that this unpremeditated step has decided his future (p. 107 f.). Having thus cast in his lot with the revolutionaries, he wages a conflict between a desire for private happiness with Lukardis and his obligation to the cause. His struggle not to yield to love and the resulting decision in favor of duty add a further element of inner conflict, vital to the drama but not found in the "novelle." Nadinsky's idealistic sacrifice assumes almost tragic proportions in view of the fact that the unscrupulous, unprincipled leader of the revolutionary forces stands ready to use him as a mere pawn.

The high point in both drama and "novelle" is the subtle portrayal of Lukardis and her changing moods. She is pictured as a young girl of virginal purity who shrinks from sullyng contacts with the world of whose evils she has but dimly been aware. Her first important decision sweeps her from calm, sheltered life into a den of vice. Thrown in with degraded, odious beings, forced to pose outwardly in the humiliating rôle of a mistress, her life and reputation in jeopardy, she is brought in closest proximity to an unknown, attractive young man. She is surprised at her own decision, timid one moment and resolute the next; she is terrified even by her reflection in the mirrors, and loathes the dissembling she must practice before the servants. Though trembling at the sight of a rat and unnerved at the murder committed in an adjoining room, she binds Nadinsky's wounds, comforts and encourages him in his moments of despondence, regains her composure as her pride comes to her aid, draws on hidden, unfathomable sources of strength, influences Nadinsky at critical junctures, is ready to live in a compensatory dream world separated from the man she has come to love, and manifests a mystic exaltation when he has gone. Moments of fortitude are followed repeatedly by anguished fear. In the drama she collapses after Nadinsky makes his escape. A sincere tribute to the integrity and loyalty of her character lies in Kussin's conviction of her innocence even when toward the end of the play he confronts her in the very rooms which he knows have sheltered her and Nadinsky for two days.

In keeping with the demands of the stage Wassermann gave more attention to the building up of suspense in the drama. This is achieved through increased emphasis upon terrifying sounds, noises and hubbub in adjoining rooms, the insistent warnings of Anastasia who counsels Lukardis in detail about her conduct, telling her that the fate of Nadinsky depends on her caution, through revolutionary intrigue and arrest, through Nadinsky's reluctance to leave Lukardis alone when he flees, and finally by the introduction of Olga Petrowna, Krasnucha and Kussin. None of these three characters figures in the "novelle." Moreover, in the narrative, Anastasia is a much more restrained, courageous person with less nervous haste, and less inclined to heighten apprehension by impressing Lukardis with the danger of her undertaking.

Olga Petrowna, mistress of the *maison de rendezvous*, adds to the tension in the drama because of her covetous, obtrusive, suspicious, sly nature. Endowed with astute powers of combination, she immediately infers Nadinsky's identity from the commissar's gossip, makes threats of betrayal, demands hush money, and arouses fear because of her venality. The murder of Olga in an adjoining room is fraught with far greater danger to the safety of Nadinsky than the shooting of a mere guest in the "novelle," since her death causes a greater uproar, and results in an investigation by the police.

Krasnucha, the revolutionary, who appears only in the drama, is a cynical, ironical, shifty, incalculable, diabolical individual, devoid of convictions, and ready to play both ends against the middle. For him Nadinsky is but a pawn in his unscrupulous game; if endangered, he would not hesitate to sacrifice the young officer. His ambiguous, unreliable character is well summed up in his own words: "Ich bin ein Mensch, der alles in Schweben halten muß . . . bis zum letzten Augenblick. Mit Politik zu tun haben heisst von der Gnade des letzten Augenblicks abhängen" (p. 119). The possibility of betrayal of Nadinsky's secret by him represents a constant threat, and after the murder of Olga his appearance in the guise of a police officer terrifies Nadinsky into a rather sensational revelation of his identity.

Senator Kussin is merely alluded to in the "novelle." His discovery that Lukardis has not left Moscow, that she and Anastasia are accomplices, and that Anastasia has been in Krasnucha's home since Lukardis' disappearance, greatly heightens the tension in the drama. His threats to Krasnucha make it seem all the more plau-

sible that the latter may betray Nadinsky to save his own skin. The scene in which these two characters figure is sensationally sinister. Arrests, confiscations and treason among the revolutionaries add to the fear and suspense.

On the whole, Wassermann's use of dialogue in the drama is very skillful. There are no asides, the three brief monologues, spoken by Olga (p. 16), Lukardis (p. 23 f.), and Krasnucha (p. 81), total only twenty-two words, and are negligible. It is remarkable that Wassermann, whose only other ventures in drama are *Die ungleichen Schalen* of the year 1912, and two short plays published in 1898, used dramatic dialogue so successfully, and did not feel constrained to use the convenient device of longer monologues at all, not even to reveal Lukardis' thoughts and emotions while Nadinsky lay asleep. He made effective use of exclamations, questions, interruptions and broken dialogue to express moods, breathless suspense, anguish, profound agitation and terror. The silence of Kussin after his interview with Krasnucha, as well as the silence of Lukardis, when confronted by her fiancé Kussin in the *maison de rendezvous* after Nadinsky's escape, is profoundly affecting. Expressive gestures accompany speech in both narrative and drama. An impressive scene of clever dialogue marks the meeting between Kussin and Krasnucha; each one distrusts and endeavors to intimidate the other. Careful attention is given to change of mood, tone of voice, pitch, tempo, rhythm and intensity.

Wassermann, who is fond of strained, highly climactic, tense situations in his novels, occasionally tends to become sensational in this drama of intrigue with its constant danger of discovery. This tendency is particularly pronounced in the quarrel and murder of Olga Petrowna, the hysterical howling of the knave Igor in the wake of the murder, in Kussin's crushing of a cognac glass in his bare hand to impress Krasnucha with his strength and determination, and in Krasnucha's diabolical playing on the fears of Lukardis and Nadinsky. There is far more restraint in the "novelle."

The drama ends on a high pitch of intensity with an ecstatic cry of Lukardis, whereas the "novelle" ends calmly, objectively and almost laconically with the words: "Nadinsky blieb verschollen. Einige Leute behaupteten, er lebe auf einer Farm im westlichen Kanada. Niemals hat Lukardis seinen Namen erfahren, niemals er den ihren."

JOHN C. BLANKENAGEL

ZUM LEICH WALTHERS VON DER VOGELWEIDE

Bei den verschiedenen Besprechungen des umstrittenen Mittelstückes im Leiche Walthers vermisste ich eine Beobachtung, die gegen die ursprüngliche Zugehörigkeit dieses Teils zum Leich zu sprechen scheint. Von Kraus [*Untersuchungen*, 8] will in diesem Mittelstück eine ganz passende Brücke vom ersten Hauptteil zum zweiten sehen, ich glaube, die Brücke passt nicht ganz.

Über die Struktur des Leichs wird man heute wohl einer Meinung sein. Der erste Hauptteil kommt mit dem Vers 5, 18 [P. 66] zu Ende, das Mittelstück endet mit dem Vers 6, 6 [P. 90], der zweite Hauptteil mit dem Vers 7, 24 [P. 144]. Nun ist zu beobachten, dass jeder dieser Abschnitte mit einem Gebet schliesst. Am Ende des ersten Hauptteils wird die Heilige Jungfrau gebeten, den Herrn zu bitten, dass dieser die Bedürfnisse der Menschen befriedige. die Jungfrau selbst solle den Menschen ihren Trost hernieder senden [5, 15-18]. Am Ende des zweiten Hauptteils wird die Heilige Jungfrau gebeten, den Zorn Gottes gegen die sundhaften Menschen zu besänftigen [7, 21-24]. Am Ende des Leichs wird die Jungfrau gebeten, gnädig ihre Bitte vor dem Ursprung der Erbarmung erheben zu wollen, dass den Menschen ihre innig bereuten Missetaten vergeben werden mochten [7, 33-8, 3]. In allen drei Gebeten denkt sich der Dichter die Jungfrau als Furbitterin der Menschheit vor Gottes Thron. Nun heisst es aber am Ende des Mittelstücks [5, 39-6, 6]:¹

Nu biten wir die muoter und ouch der muoter barn
si reine und er vil guoter, daz sie uns tuon bewarn
wan âne sie kan nieman hie noch dort genesen
und widerredet daz iemen, der muoz ein tøre wesen

Hier werden also die Heilige Jungfrau und ihr Sohn Christus gebeten, den Menschen zu schützen [Bartsch, *et al.*], oder zu bewirken, daß die Menschen sich behuten [Von Kraus, *Untersuchungen* 16]. Der Herr Gott wird nicht nur aus dem Spiele gelassen; es wird noch ausdrücklich gesagt, daß nur die Jungfrau und Christus den Menschen zum Heil verhelfen können. Wer sich direkt an Gott wenden wollte, musste ein Tor sein. Das tut eben Walther aber mehrfach, z. B. 3, 17-20, 6, 27-29.

¹ Text nach Paul, 87-90.

Ferner heisst es in der nächsten Strophe, der ersten des zweiten Hauptteils [6, 7-10; P. 91-94], daß Gott die Sunde vergibt oder nicht vergibt. Die Überlieferung lautet hier.

Wie mac des niemer werden rât,
 der umbe sîne missetât
 nicht herzelicher riuwe hât,
 sit got enheine sunde lât,
 Die niht geriuwent zaller stunt 95
 hin abe unz ûf des herzen grunt?
 dem wîsen ist daz allez kunt,
 daz niemer sêle wirt gesunt,
 diu mit der sunden swert ist wunt,
 sîn habe von grunde heiles funt 100

Diesen zehn Zeilen entsprechen vier Reimpaare des ersten Teils [3, 13-20, P. 13-20]. Die Strophe ist also um zwei Zeilen zu lang, um in den Kursus hineinzupassen. Walther Steller hat vorgeschlagen [PBB 45, 333], die beiden Zeilen 6, 11, 12 [P. 95-96] als "später hinzugefügt" zu betrachten. Daran hat er aber noch zu wenig getan, denn die Zeile 6, 10 [P. 94] "*sit got enheine sunde lât*" ist dann dem Sinne nach unmöglich. Ich meine, das Wort *enheine* ist ebenso verdächtig als die beiden "später hinzugefügten" Zeilen, es steht augenscheinlich an der Stelle eines ursprünglichen *aleine*. Setzen wir also *aleine* statt *enheine*, so entkommen wir der "Sackgasse" [Michels, zur Stelle], in die uns Steller geführt hat. Der Gedanke, daß Gott allein die Sunde vergibt, passt ganz gut zur Auffassung der drei Gebete am Ende des ersten, des zweiten Hauptteils und des ganzen Leichs. Er passt aber absolut nicht zum Gedanken des Gebets am Ende des Mittelstücks. Man kann sich auch vorstellen, dass er einem eifrigen Priester damals wenig gefiel. Selbst der Gedanke dieser Stelle in der überlieferten Form passt nicht aufs beste zum Gedanken des Gebets am Ende des Mittelstücks. Der Gegensatz "Nur die Jungfrau und ihr Sohn bringen dem Menschen sein Heil" und "Gott vergibt keine Sunde, die nicht innig bereut wird," ist ja doch ein Gegensatz.

Es ist klar, dass die ursprüngliche Form der Zeilen 6, 7-16 [P. 91-100] und die ursprüngliche Form der ihr vorausgehenden Strophe keinen grellen theologischen Gegensatz haben enthalten können. Ebenso ist es höchst unwahrscheinlich, dass Walther in diesem Gedichte drei Gebete von einem Standpunkt aus gedichtet hätte, um ein viertes von einem im Sinne des Dogmas anderen

Standpunkt aus mitten drein zu mischen. Ohne zwingende Gründe wird keiner an so was glauben wollen. Lässt man dieses Mittelstück fort, so hängt das Ganze harmonisch zusammen, besonders wenn man ferner die Unstimmigkeit der höheren Responsion dadurch entfernt, daß man die Zeilen 6, 11, 12 tilgt und 6, 10 emendiert, wie oben vorgeschlagen. Dabei ist zu beobachten, daß ausser diesen Zeilen 6, 11, 12 nur eine einzige [6, 23, P. 107] die Form der Responsion stört. Man darf nämlich im zweiten Teil weniger haben als im ersten, nicht aber mehr. Diese einzige Zeile [6, 23] gilt allgemein als unecht.

Nehmen wir dagegen an, das Mittelstück sei später dem Leiche hinzugedichtet, dann wäre unumgänglich, daß der Zudichter etwas Drastisches mit einer Zeile [6, 10] "*sît got aleine sunde lât*" hatte unternehmen müssen. Daß er die Schwierigkeit nicht ganz überwunden hat, liefert uns den Beweis, daß er es doch versuchte.

Wegen der Unstimmigkeit zwischen dem Gebete des Mittelstückes und den Schluss-Gebeten jedes anderen Abschnitts der Dichtung, sowie wegen der Unstimmigkeit zwischen diesem Gebet und dem Gedanken der ihm gleich nachfolgenden Strophe, glaube ich nicht, daß dieses Mittelstück "ganz passend die Brücke vom ersten Hauptteil zum zweiten schlägt." Und ich meine, eben diese Unstimmigkeit ist noch ein Grund, die ursprüngliche Zugehörigkeit dieses Mittelstückes zum Leiche zu bezweifeln.

R.-M. S. HEFFNER

University of Wisconsin

SIDNEY'S METAPHOR OF THE ULCER

In the introduction to his *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, G. G. Smith indicates that "Sidney's metaphor of the ulcer discovers a trace of that Italian tradition which expresses the original medical sense of *κἀθαρσις*."¹ The passage under consideration is a part of the famous defense of tragedy in the *Apologie for Poetrie*, where Sidney wrote:

So that the right vse of Comedy will (I thinke) by no body be blamed, and much lesse of the high and excellent Tragedy, that openeth the greatest

¹ *Elizabethan Critical Essays* (Oxford, 1904), I, lxxxvi

wounds, and sheweth foith the Vlcers that are couered with Tissue that maketh Kinges feare to be Tyrants, and Tyrants to manifest their tyrannicall humors, that, with sturring the affects of admiration and commiseration, teacheth the vncertainety of this world, and vpon how weake foundations guldien roofes are builded 2

It seems to me that the association of Italian Renaissance interpretations of catharsis with this passage is definitely misleading; Sidney's meaning can be explained much more conveniently in terms of conventional Elizabethan literary theory, without reference to obscure or remote sources.

One can't be quite certain of what is meant by "the original medical sense of *κάθαρσις*,"³ but it is possible to examine the discussions of the Italian interpreters who contributed to the so-called "medical" tradition. The first modern discussion of catharsis of which we have any record is that of G. B. Casalis which appears in his *De tragedia et comoedia lucubratio*.⁴ Since it utilizes the noun *purgatio* to render *κάθαρσις*, it may be loosely termed "medical."⁵ Casalis explained the purgation as a threefold operation: (1) tragedy inures the spectators to calamity, (2) it teaches them what are the proper circumstances under which they should indulge in pity and fear; (3) it shows the common fate of all humanity and

² *Ibid.*, I, 177

³ The controversy over the meaning of the last clause in Aristotle's definition of tragedy has by no means been settled. Cf. the discussions of the subject in Ingram Bywater, *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry*, Oxford, 1909, D. S. Margoliouth, *The Poetics of Aristotle*, London, 1911, Augusto Rostagni, *La Poetica di Aristotele*, Turin, 1934, and Alfred Gudeman, *Aristoteles Poetik*, Berlin and Leipzig, 1934. Gudeman admits, *op cit.*, p. 172, that we are ignorant of the psychological process Aristotle had in mind when he mentioned "catharsis", and he believes, moreover, that we are not likely to know more about it in the future.

⁴ The exact date of the work is unknown. See Lane Cooper and Alfred Gudeman, *A Bibliography of the Poetics of Aristotle* (New Haven, 1928), p. 51.

⁵ Recent commentators frequently class interpretations of catharsis under two headings (1) those which employ words meaning "purge," which are called "medical" or "pathological"; (2) those which employ words meaning "purify" or "cleanse," which are called "ethical." See, for example, Bywater, *op cit.*, p. 152. This distinction, however, is not exact, for some interpretations do not fall in either category, and some, like Scanno's, which is discussed below, involve a moderation rather than a purgation but are at the same time clearly "medical."

thus reconciles the spectators to their own misfortunes.⁶ Exactly the same explanation occurs in the first modern commentary on the text of the *Poetics*, that of Robortelli.⁷ In his *Discorsi*, G. B. Giraldis Cintio held that tragedy, by means of the pitiful and the terrible, purges the spectator of vices and conduces to virtue.⁸ What is supposedly one of the first instances of a "pathological" interpretation of catharsis appeared in Giovanni della Casa's great courtesy book, *Il Galateo*. Della Casa found that the lamentation inspired by tragedies is efficacious in healing grief.⁹ An interpretation involving a purgation of the emotions themselves rather than of the spectator was advanced in Pietro Vettori's commentary on the *Poetics*. Vettori used the word *purgatio*; however, he did not mean by it a "clearing away" of pity and fear, but a moderation of these passions and of others which are evil only in excess.¹⁰ One of the most frequently cited "medical" interpretations is that in A. S. Minturno's *Arte Poetica*,¹¹ but it should be observed that Minturno merely compared the effect of tragedy to a homoeopathic medical

⁶ Casalio's work was printed in Jac Gronovius, *Thesaurus graecarum antiquitatum*, Leyden, 1697-1702. For the above discussion see Vol VIII, col. 1600.

⁷ *Francisci Robortelli Utinensis in librum Aristotelis de Arte poetica explicationes*, 2 ed (Basel, 1555), p. 46.

⁸ *Scritti Estetici* (Milan, 1864), II, 12. He explained that this process takes place because the spectator avoids imitating the vicious actions of the tragic personage for fear of coming to a like end. This, as we shall see below, is the position taken by Sidney. But the notion that tragedies function as exempla is not particularly Aristotelian and certainly not peculiarly Italian. Moreover, it is not implicit in the metaphor of the ulcer.

⁹ See Ingram Bywater, "Milton and the Aristotelian Definition of Tragedy," *Journal of Philology*, xxvii (1901), 274. The idea here expressed, however, may well be a non-Aristotelian commonplace. It is found also in the passage from Timocles, *Athenaeus*, vi, 233, and in Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations*, x, 6, where it is not now generally considered to be of Peripatetic origin.

¹⁰ *Commentarii in primum librum Aristotelis de Arte poetarum*, 2 ed (Florence, 1573), p. 54.

¹¹ The *Arte Poetica* was an Italian elaboration of an earlier Latin *De Poeta*. In the *De Poeta*, Minturno used the verb *expio* to translate the idea of catharsis, thus introducing religious rather than medical connotations. He explained that tragedy acts as a warning against vicious passions. For his translation of the catharsis clause, see Bywater, *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry*, p. 361. The interpretation is discussed by J. E. Spingarn, *Literary Criticism in the Renaissance* (New York, 1908), p. 70.

treatment,¹² he did not explain the purgation in terms of the medical theories of his time but simply elaborated the first and third points of the process described by Casaho and Robortelli, whom, incidentally, he refrained from mentioning.¹³ A more plausibly "medical" explanation was offered in M. Antonio Scaino's edition of the *Politics*. Scaino assumed that the emotions were related to the humours in Aristotle's writings, and that the result of the tragic catharsis is a feeling of relief and calm. Tragedy is said to moderate the excess of the disturbing humour, but this effect is brought about "*col mezzo del soave parlare*."¹⁴ These are the most important "medical" explanations of catharsis before 1581. It seems impossible to me to read them, either individually or collectively in some sort of "tradition," into Sidney's statement that tragedy "sheweth forth the Vlcers that are couered with Tissue."

Before considering the literary theory underlying the metaphor of the ulcer, let us try to determine what the metaphor itself means. Fortunately, it occurs elsewhere in Elizabethan literature. Lyly's Euphues describes his warm but unrevealed love in the following words.

Well, well, seeing the wound that bleedeth inwarde is most daungerous, that the fire kepte close burneth most furious, that the Oouen dammed vp baketh soonest, that sores hauing no vent fester inwardly, it is high time to vnfolde my secret loue, to my secrete friende.¹⁵

In this case the "wound" is Euphues' love, and it is the more painful for being concealed. Again, in the address "To the Gentlemen of the Inns of Court" which prefaces Lodge's *Alarum against Usurers*, the author, who is about to expose the secret devices of certain Elizabethan racketeers, remarks, "I thought good in opening the wound to prevent an ulcer."¹⁶ In other words, he hoped to put a stop to a hidden evil by exposing it. Another relevant passage appears in the *Misfortunes of Arthur*:

I neuer yet sawe hurt so smoothly heald,
But that the skarre bewraid the former wound
Yea, where the salue did soonest close the skinne,

¹² *Arte Poetica* (Naples, 1725), p. 76. Cf. Spingarn, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

¹³ *Arte Poetica*, pp. 76-77.

¹⁴ Quoted by Bywater, "Milton and the Aristotelian Definition," p. 271.

¹⁵ John Lyly, *Works*, ed. R. W. Bond (Oxford, 1902), I, 210.

¹⁶ *An Alarum against Usurers*, ed. David Laing, Shakespeare Society (London, 1853), p. 36.

The sore was oftner couered vp than cur'de
 Which festering deepe and filde within, at last
 With sodaine breach grew greater than at first
 What then for mindes, which haue reuenging moodes,
 And ne'r forget the crosse they forced beare
 Whereto if reconcilment come, it makes
 The t'one secure, whiles t'other workes his will
 Attonement sield defeates, but oft deferres
 Reuenge beware a reconciled foe ¹⁷

All of these passages obviously stress the danger of concealed maladjustments. But in what sense does tragedy, opening the wounds and showing the ulcers within, reveal such maladjustments? And what are the evils Sidney had in mind?

The answers to these questions are to be found in the conventional Elizabethan conception of tragedy. Puttenham, in accounting for the origin of tragedy, tells us that in ancient times great men succumbed to "lusts and licentiousness of life," and that after they were dead and no longer to be feared

their infamous life and tyrannies were laid open to all the world, then wickedness reproched, their follies and extreme insolencies deided, and their miserable ends painted out in playes and pageants to shew the mutabilitie of fortune, and the iust punishment of God in reuenge of vicious and euill life ¹⁸

Nashe wrote in his *Pierce Penilesse* that "playes . . . shew the ill success of treason, the fall of hastie climbers, the wretched end of vsurpers, the miserie of ciuill dissention, and how iust God is euer more in punishing of murther." ¹⁹ And Heywood wrote that "if we present a tragedy, we include the fatall and abortive ends of such as commit notorious murders, which is aggravated and acted with all the art that may be to terrifie men from the like abhorred practices" ²⁰ These selections are fairly typical, I think, of Elizabethan apology for the stage, according to which the chief function of tragedy is the exposure of the previously unknown criminal activities of the tragic personages and of their subsequent punishment, to the end that the spectators may be discouraged from pursuing such activities themselves.

Sidney's "wounds" are thus the crimes presented on the stage,

¹⁷ III, i, 109-120.

¹⁸ *The Arte of English Poesie*, I, xv

¹⁹ *Works*, ed. R. B. McKerrow (London, 1910), I, 213

²⁰ *An Apologie for Actors*, Shakespeare Society (London, 1854), p. 53.

and the metaphor of the ulcer refers to the content of tragedy, not to its effect. His remarks on the effect of tragedy immediately following the metaphor simply reflect, like those of Puttenham, Nashe, and Heywood, the commonplace notion that plays should act as *exempla*, an idea which Sidney himself dwelt upon in the course of his discussion of the relative merits of poetry and history. There he observed that "if euill men come to the stage, they euer goe out (as the Tragedie Writer answered to one that misliked the shew of such persons) so manacled as they little animate folkes to followe them."²¹ Aristotle certainly never thought of the tragic stage as a gallery of rogues.

D. W. ROBERTSON

University of Maryland

SEVENTEENTH CENTURY PUBLISHING ECONOMY

In 1613 Felix Kingston printed for William Aspley John Boys' *An exposition of the last psalme*. In 1615 the same printer and publisher issued another edition of the work. The Folger Library contains copies of both of these editions and another copy which, by its strange make-up, illustrates the lengths to which a seventeenth century printer would go in order to effect economies. This copy is composed of sheets of the 1613 edition (STC 3464) and of the 1615 edition (STC 3465). Both of these editions are quartos in 8's (Collation: A^s, B^s). Each gathering, then, is composed of two sheets. Since gathering B has only 6 leaves, the inner sheet is a half sheet. Leaves A1, A2, A7 and A8, the outer sheet of A, and leaves B3 and B4, the inner sheet of B, are of the 1615 edition, the remaining leaves are of the 1613 edition. Signatures B1v, B2r, B5v and B6r, the inner forme of the outer sheet of B, are as originally issued in 1613, with no running titles and with the page numbers in the center of the upper margin. Leaves A3-A6, the inner sheet of A, and signatures B1r, B2v, B5r and B6v, the outer forme of the outer sheet of B, are as originally issued in 1613 except that in 1615 they were again put through the press and had running titles printed on them, overprinting the original page numbers, and new page numbers were printed in the outer corners.

²¹ Smith, *op. cit.*, I, 170.

When he decided to bring out a new edition in 1615, Aspley evidently wanted to use up some sheets which remained from the 1613 edition, and, in order to make them look like those of the 1615 edition, he decided to print running titles and new page numbers on them. The simplest method of doing this would be to leave the running titles and page numbers of the 1615 edition set up and use them for the overprinting on the 1613 sheets. This was not done, however, for the running titles and page numbers used in the overprinting are not printed from the same setting of type as the 1615 edition. Probably the whole operation was an afterthought.

A census of other copies of this work shows that the Folger copy of the regular 1615 edition (STC 3465) is the only copy which is composed wholly of sheets of the 1615 edition; it has no overprinted leaves. The Wadham College copy of this edition is the same as the Folger copy of mixed editions (STC 3465a). The other known copies—the two Bodleian, the Cambridge University, the Lambeth Palace, and the McAlpin, all contain overprinted leaves and differ from the Folger and Wadham copies only in that they have the overprinting on four additional pages—signatures B1v, B2r, B5v and B6r—the inner forme of the outer sheet of B.

RAY O. HUMMEL, JR.

Folger Shakespeare Library

“ON THE NEW FORCERS OF CONSCIENCE,” LINE 17

In the Trinity College manuscript, line 17 of Milton's *Sonetto Caudato* “On the new forcers of Conscience under the Long Parliament,” originally written

“Cropp yee as close as marginall P——s eares,”

was changed to

“[C]lip your Phylacteries though bauke your eares.”¹

It has been assumed that Milton deleted the transparent allusion to Prynne either because he thought it questionable taste to joke publicly about Prynne's sufferings,² or because he thought the man

¹ *Facsimile of the Manuscript of Milton's Minor Poems*, ed. W. A. Wright (Cambridge, 1899), p. 45.

² See, e. g., Smart, *The Sonnets of Milton* (Glasgow, 1921), p. 132, Masson, *Life of Milton* (London, 1859-1880), III, 470.

"too contemptible to merit naming."³ Probably at least as strong a reason was that the substituted line afforded a more specific threat against the intolerant Presbyterians in the Westminster Assembly, which those theologians must have been well able to understand. A brief examination of the connotations of "Phylacteries" and "eares" will make this threat clear.

Phylacteries or *tefillin* are Pentateuchal texts (Exod. 13: 1-10, 11-16, Deut. 6. 4-9 and 11 13-21) carried in leather boxes attached by thongs to the forehead and hand, in accordance with Exod. 13. 9, 16, and Deut. 6 8 and 11. 18. "The Talmud lays great stress on the tephillin ceremonial, and carries its prescriptions into the minutest details, which are assumed to be Mosaic."⁴ Magnification of the size or importance of these pious "signs" has come to be a symbol of hypocrisy through Jesus' denunciation of the scribes and Pharisees: "all their works they do for to be seen of men. they make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments."⁵ When Milton warns the Presbyterians, then, that the Parliament may clip their phylacteries, he means simply that they may be compelled to relinquish their hypocritical bigotry, at least to the extent of providing for the free existence of Independent congregations in England.

But when he adds that the Parliament will probably spare their ears, he is hinting that these "new forcers of conscience" will be lucky if they escape a far severer punishment—their own exclusion from the clergy. They should remember that the Mosaic qualifications for the priesthood in Leviticus emphatically exclude any man "that hath a blemish."⁶ Although ears are not explicitly mentioned in this connection, the ritual pronounced and practised by Moses for consecrating the priests included putting blood from the second ram "upon the tip of the right ear of Aaron, and upon the tip of the right ear of his sons."⁷ Furthermore, the Talmudic

³ *The Student's Milton*, ed. F. A. Patterson (N. Y., revised edition, 1933), Notes, p. 56

⁴ *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* (N. Y., copyright 1911), xi, 301. See *The Jewish Encyclopedia* (N. Y., 1905), x, 22-5, for precise specifications covering even such details as the number of stitches to be used and the form of the knots (to represent certain letters).

⁵ Matt. 23. 5; the whole chapter condemns their hypocrisy. The parallel abuse of fringes quoted refers to Num. 15 38-9.

⁶ In Lev. 21:17-23, the word "blemish" occurs six times, and twelve distinct blemishes are specified as physical disqualifications.

⁷ Exod. 29: 20; cf. Lev. 8. 23-4.

Mishnah specifies, in its detailed compilation of disqualifying blemishes, an ear that is slit (even though no part of it is lacking), ears of obviously unequal size, and ears too large or too small.⁸ And Hyrcanus II (great-grandnephew of Judas Maccabaeus) was deprived of his ears by his nephew Antigonus for the express purpose of preventing his restoration to the priesthood.⁹

Whether or not Milton had read Josephus' account of Hyrcanus before writing the line in question,¹⁰ the bitter experience of Alexander Gill the younger, his former teacher and friend, was sufficient to direct his thoughts to the significant connection between ears and the priesthood. For in 1628, when Gill had recklessly expressed approval of Felton's assassination of Buckingham, the Star Chamber included in his sentence degradation from the ministry and the loss of one ear at London and the other at Oxford.¹¹ Though the mutilation was not carried out, the sentence must have impressed Milton, who was then corresponding with Gill.¹²

When read in the light of these connotations, the last eight lines of the *Sonetto Caudato* gain considerably in force and definiteness. The reference to clipped phylacteries leaves no doubt that Milton regarded the "tricks" of line 13 as hypocritical; at the same time the Mosaic background of phylacteries would prepare theologically trained readers to recall that the loss of ears meant disqualification from the priesthood. And that thought in turn would not only anticipate the climactic last line,

"New Presbyter is but Old Priest writ Large,"

but also intimate to the Presbyterians that the line had more than etymological significance.

DONALD C. DORIAN

New Jersey College for Women

⁸ *The Mishnah*, translated by Herbert Danby (Oxford, 1933), "Bekhoroth," 6 1, 6 10, 7. 4 (pp. 536-8). It should be noted that the first two defects cited above concern Firstlings (animal-offerings); but all such blemishes apply likewise to priests (*ibid.*, 7 1, p. 538).

⁹ Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, Bk. xiv, chap. xiii, sec 10, and *The Wars of the Jews*, Bk. I, chap. xiii, sec 9.

¹⁰ He refers to it in the *Defensio Prima*, written only four or five years later. See *Works*, Columbia edition (N Y, 1931-1938), vii, 238-42.

¹¹ Masson, *Life of Milton*, I (revised edition), 214.

¹² Milton, *Epistolae Familiares*, 2, 3, 5.

BOTANGO, AN ENGLISH GHOST-WORD

Bernard Romans, in a lengthy description of West Florida written on his rare map of 1772, estimates the annual catch of fish in Florida waters at a thousand tons. "I Cannot help relating," he says, "that in the Winters of the Years One thousand seven hundred and sixty nine and seventy I lay by the side of a Spaniard in Aisa Hatcha [now Indian River] who during Six Weeks made up a Cargo of Two Thousand Arobas [*sic*] of Red anl Black Drum Fish, dry'd and salted, Besides Several hundred Turbots and fourteen Thousand Mullet rows made into Botango. . . ."¹

Naturally, Romans uses some obsolete spellings, as, for instance, *Tarpom* [Tarpon] and *rows* [roes]; he also records not a few geographic names in erroneous forms, such as *Fangippoha* [Tangipahoa], *Tampo* or *Tampe* [Tampa], *Triscaloosa* [Tuscaloosa], *Tascagoula* [Pascagoula], and *Boca Seco* [B. Seca]. It is, then, reasonable to assume that *Botango* is due either to Romans' or to a printer's misapprehension of *botargo*, a word which was adopted into English in 1598 (*NED.*) as *botarge* from Italian *botargo*, *botarga*, now *bottarga*, *pottarga*, the Italian forms being themselves adaptations of Arabic *batāriḥ*, *buṭāriḥ*, "caviare." *Botargo*, indeed, is the name of a variety of caviare made from the roe of the mullet. Pepys, as might be expected, was familiar with a delicacy of this kind: "Drinking great draughts of claret, and eating botargo, and bread and butter" is the passage from his *Diary* of June 5, 1661, aptly cited in the *New English Dictionary*.

French *boutargue* (1534, Rabelais), a form sometimes met with in English, is adopted from Provençal *boutargo*, which springs in turn from Arabic, perhaps through obsolete Spanish *botagra*.

Dr. H. L. Ballowe, of Buras, Louisiana, informs me that a friend of his was served with *boutargue* at a noted French restaurant in New Orleans. Some of the Creoles of that city are doubtless still familiar with the word.

The etymology of the group *botargo-boutargue* has been often noted. One may consult especially Lammens, *Remarques sur les mots français dérivés de l'arabe* (Beyrouth, 1890), p. 56; Lokotsch, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der europäischen Wörter orientalischen Ursprungs* (Heidelberg, 1927), No. 274; Meyer-Lubke, *REW*²

¹ P. Lee Phillips, *Notes on the Life and Works of Bernard Romans*, Appendix (Deland, Florida, 1924), p. 125.

(Heidelberg, 1935), No. 6705; Sainéan, *Sources Indigènes* (Firenze, 1935), pp. 314, 315. *Botargo*, strange to say, is not included in Serjeantson's *History of Foreign Words in English* (New York, 1936), nor is Spanish *botarga* noticed in Steiger's *Contribución á la fonética del hispano-árabe* . . . (Madrid, 1932).

WILLIAM A. READ

Louisiana State University

JOHANN GEORG JACOBI'S *DIE WINTERREISE*

Goedeke mentions Jacobi's *Winterreise* as printed in Dusseldorf in 1769, with 91 pages, but there is another edition with the same text, 102 pages long, which is not listed. Professor Kurrelmeyer has a copy of this edition, which also carries the imprint "Düsseldorf, 1769," and in studying this hitherto unmentioned printing I have called it copy A. It has no peculiarities in the text, while copy B, the printing mentioned by Goedeke, often has *VV* or *vv* for *W* or *w*, and spells consistently *-ey-* where copy A spells with *-er-*. Copy B, furthermore, doubles the *n* or *s* of such words as *bin*, *bis*, *Bosheit*, but at the same time spells with one *n* such words as *kann* and *konnte*.

Copy B also has the following typographical errors: page 48, line 18, *unterdrueken*; p. 77, l. 16, *guhterzige*; p. 33, l. 15, and p. 89, l. 2, *uud*. The following minor differences in usage appear. A (p. 72 l. 6) *Ein critisch Volkchen*, B (p. 64 l. 6) *Ein Critisch Volkchen*, A (p. 75 l. 7) *diamantner Reif*, B (p. 67 l. 4) *Diamantner Reif*, A (p. 83 l. 16) *ein bruderlicher Fluß*, B (p. 74 l. 11) *ein Bruderlicher Fluß*; A (p. 88 l. 9) *ein vergnugter Morgen*, B (p. 78 l. 5) *ein vergnugterer Morgen*; A (p. 98 l. 4) *ein menschenfreundlicher Pralat*, B (p. 87 l. 12) *ein Menschenfreundlicher Pralat*. More important are the following differences. A (p. 30 l. 16) *Temperament*, but B (p. 29 l. 12) *Temperant*; A (p. 67 l. 7) *lehrt ihm unsre Redlichkeit*, B (p. 59 l. 18) *lehrt ihn unsre Redlichkeit*; A (p. 83 l. 4) *Zum Vertrauten haben*, B (p. 73 l. 16) *Zum vertrauten haben*.

It is hardly possible to determine from these few variations in text which is the original printing, but one could assume from the larger number of pages that copy A, unmentioned by Goedeke, is the original.

EVERETT BUSHNELL GLADDING

The Johns Hopkins University

REVIEWS

Hawthorne's Contemporaneous Reputation A Study of Literary Opinion in England and America, 1824-1864. By BERTHA FAUST. Philadelphia The University of Pennsylvania Press, 1939. Pp 163

James McHenry (1785-1845) Playwright and Novelist. By ROBERT E BLANC Philadelphia The University of Pennsylvania Press, 1939. Pp 136

Frank R. Stockton. By MARTIN I. J. GRIFFIN. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 1939 Pp. ix + 178

Elizabeth Stuart Phelps. By MARY ANGELA BENNETT Philadelphia The University of Pennsylvania Press, 1939 Pp. vii + 172.

Henry Blake Fuller By CONSTANCE M GRIFFIN. Philadelphia The University of Pennsylvania Press, 1939. Pp. vii + 117.

These five dissertations from the University of Pennsylvania bear testimony to Professor Arthur Hobson Quinn's enthusiasm in leading a phalanx of students in an attack upon unsolved problems in the field of American fiction. Each deals with a worthy subject, but it is not surprising that the most important contribution to scholarship is found in Miss Faust's study of Hawthorne's reputation between the years 1828 and 1864. Here is a detailed chronological analysis of all discoverable magazine reviews, of occasional newspaper items, and of a few references in diaries and letters, such as Emerson's perceptive if disparaging utterances. Doubtless more material lies hidden in newspapers, but it is questionable whether further data would alter Miss Faust's incisively phrased generalizations. She demonstrates that, because Hawthorne's early writings followed a familiar pattern, critics failed to note any striking difference between his contributions to the annuals and those of lesser writers like Miss Catherine M Sedgwick and N. P. Willis. The addition of humor to *The House of the Seven Gables*, following the sombre narrative of *Hester Prynne*, resulted from a contemporary critical opinion that pathos must be relieved by humor. Stated again, but in greater detail than hitherto, is the chilling effect upon his literary reputation of Hawthorne's campaign biography of Franklin Pierce. Indeed, Miss Faust's study illuminates the whole course of American literary criticism in these years through excellent commentaries upon Longfellow's senti-

mental appreciation in 1837, upon the demand for purity, religious sentiment, Shakespeare-like fertility of invention and variety, and through a clear exposition of the ethical bias of romantic critics. The author concludes that Hawthorne probably remained unaffected by the 150 comments published during his lifetime.

The four biographies present with varying degrees of completeness chronologies of four interesting, if minor, figures. Lacunae are explained away thus "The chronicle of Frank R. Stockton's life is sometimes an exasperating story because, like all good men, he led a placid and industrious life" (p. 32). Yet Mr. Griffin increases the exasperation by failing to clarify Stockton's activities as a wood engraver, his transition from this business to editorial work, his duties on *St. Nicholas Magazine*, and his removals from one residence to another. Indeed, it appears that biography was considered secondary by all four authors, for they have strung together on a thin tissue of dates long summaries of poetry and fiction and mere bibliographical references to non-fiction. There is no probing of character, no attempt to explain the subject's mind and art beyond a perfunctory statement of his critical position, no attempt to relate the subject to his contemporaries or to contemporary social or literary conditions. All handy critical terms loosely; we learn on one page that Stockton's "method was the combination of romantic material with realistic treatment" (p. 46) and on another that "he seldom particularizes; geographical details are generally vague; . . . almost never are the details of dress or appearance of his characters given" (p. 51). More reprehensible are footnotes of citation (*Stockton*, no. 12 on page 40) which cannot be traced, and sentences which would put a subfreshman to shame: "Mrs. Phelps may well be the original of the slight sketch of Avis's mother who dies when she is a small child, but it is in Avis herself that she is most clearly drawn" (*Phelps*, p. 80; but see *McHenry*, *passim*). Yet each book contains excellent bibliographies as well as some new biographical data, so that each is now the most comprehensive study in its field.

James McHenry, a hunchback seceding Presbyterian from County Antrim, Ireland, in 1816 migrated to the United States after attaining some fame as a poet. *The Pleasures of Friendship* (1822) went through eight editions by 1841, in a generation when James Gates Percival surrendered poetry for lack of pecuniary reward and when Bryant was emerging as our leading poet. Six novels and four plays, none of great quality, some miscellaneous prose, and an epic, *The Antediluvians*, also bear McHenry's name as melancholy evidence that best sellers a century ago were, as now, often tawdry things. Unhappily Dr. Blanc's textbook clichés in the midst of frequently repeated banal phrases do not support the conclusion that McHenry "is not an altogether negligible figure."

Stockton is remembered for one of America's most intriguing

short stories, "The Lady, or the Tiger?" Most of his other writing is negligible. Beginning his career with children's stories, he won after a dozen years a place as assistant editor of *Hearth and Home* and in 1873 a similar place on *St. Nicholas*. His famous story appeared in 1884; thereafter in popularity he was honored as among the first ten American writers. Yet with the exception of *The Casting Away of Mrs. Lecks and Mrs. Aleshine* (1886), which Dr. Griffin calls "a minor classic," almost nothing else in Stockton's 23 volumes has upon it the inevitable mark of genius. Stockton's peculiar power lay in an ability to invest commonplace incidents with romantic glamour, and to achieve an air of probability in picturing a strange, fantastic realm.

Elizabeth Stuart Phelps Ward, descendant of preachers, used fiction and essay to propagate reformist doctrines. *The Gates Ajar* (1868) caught popular fancy in the days after the War Between the States and helped reassure fallen soldiers' relatives in a belief in immortal life, a theme frequently stressed by Miss Phelps. But she also campaigned for the rights of women, women's dress reform, total abstinence, antivivisection, law reform, homeopathy, and improved conditions in factories. Her many sugary writings attained immense popularity, but none has more than museum interest today. The story of Miss Phelps's marriage and the peculiarities of her temperament are here barely touched upon, and the relationship of Miss Phelps's children's stories to this type of fiction is not indicated.

Mrs. Griffin refers to immense funds of material available for telling the life story of the shy recluse, Henry Blake Fuller, but unhappily she makes use of almost none of it. The biographical element in the 76 pages of her text is scant; only in general terms do we learn of his frequent escapes from brawling, sprawling Chicago to the storied charm of European scenes. Of his daily life, his moods, his avocations, we learn almost nothing. Long summaries of his fiction are given, but the many crotchets, the wide learning, the critical bias discernible in his many essays and reviews are not discussed. As the author of two of our earliest realistic novels uncovering Chicago's infidelities, ugly newness, and brash self-esteem, Fuller merits a detailed biography, one which unhesitatingly looks into his life and actions to explain his romantic vagaries.

HARRY R. WARFEL

The University of Maryland

On Rereading Chaucer. By HOWARD R. PATCH. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1939. Pp. xi + 269.

Once upon a time when college training was really "academic," we learned definitions, and among them a definition of literature—

I think it is Henry Morley's, though the quotation may not be exact—"Literature consists of those books, and they are not so very many, in which human truth and human passion are treated with a certain largeness, sanity, and perfection of form." It seems rather schoolmasterish, no doubt, like the dictum of another schoolmaster that poetry is a criticism of life, but the teacher in one comes back to it again and again—human truth and passion endowed with a certain largeness that gives it significance, unfolded before us with sanity, and clothed with perfection of form. Only great literature does this, and nothing is literature that falls short of it. No doubt there are fashions, and fads and fancies, and literary trickeries that conform to these and so become best sellers, but they fade in a few months or years, take on an odd appearance like the fashion plates in Godey's "Lady's Book," fit only for lampshades, or they sink to the level of "documents" for the historian and sociologist, even, at long last, for the antiquarian.

One shouldn't write platitudes, even in a learned journal, but years of association with Geoffrey Chaucer and the reading one is bound to do in the literature of one own's day bring reflections like these to the surface—not because they are platitudes, but because they are true. Open Chaucer anywhere, yes, even the "Tale of Melibee," and see if it isn't true. See if the conventional moralizing of this preachment is not touched by the magic of style—Chaucer's prose has never received its due—and speaks still to our generation.

Mr. Patch has known his Chaucer a long time. He has studied him in seminars, written learned articles about him, edited the text, expounded him to generations of keen young women; but above all he has *read* him, and in this book he has set down for us what he has come to mean. Mr. Patch is not afraid to interpret. He realizes that Chaucer, like Dante or Dickens or Dos Passos, speaks out of his own age, obeys its conventions, writes in its idiom, but equally, that if these things were all, Chaucer's place would be in the historical grammars and anthologies, not in the lives of modern men. He would agree, I am sure, with the dictum of a Norwegian critic writing of *Peer Gynt*, that every great poem has as many editions as there are readers—most of them greatly abridged. The purpose of this illuminating and civilized book may be said to be to fill out these abridgments by telling us something of what an acute and sympathetic reader has found in the principal works of a great artist.

It is not easy to find the catalytic agent to hold together a volume of critical *causeries* about a writer so many-sided as Geoffrey Chaucer, but surely none could be better than his humor. And Mr. Patch's first chapter is a suggestive little essay on the idea of humor. The remaining nine chapters have to do with aspects of Chaucer's work—the Court of Love poems, the *Troilus*, the *Legend of Good Women*, the *Canterbury Tales*, Chaucer and the Common

People, Chaucer and Medieval Romance, Chaucer the Satirist, and Chaucer and the Common People. About all these matters Mr. Patch writes with sympathy and acumen, not inirequently with deep insight.

I am not sure that I understand the essence of humor much better than I did before, here, as in so many dark puzzles of this our life, I shall have to trust as hitherto in simple feeling. But Mr. Patch has made me see that the Wife of Bath's immortal exclamation,

But, Lord Crist, what it remembreth me
Upon my yowthe, and on my jolitee

is not merely pathetically amusing, for here humor reaches the sublime, as it hardly does elsewhere in our literature—not in the Porter's scene, for that is robustious, not in the Gravediggers' scene, for that cuts to the quick. No less keen is his subtle analysis of that odd elegy, the *Book of the Duchess* where the tortuous machinery of the Court of Love is touched so lightly and turned so deftly to the consolation of youth. The court of Edward III could have made nothing of *Lycidas*—one wonders if the stern eloquence of *Piers Plowman* had penetrated there,—nor of *Adonais* and *Thyrsis*. The fine lords and ladies spoke another language, and this sorrow was the sorrow of young love. And so Chaucer touched it lightly, with infinite grace and tact. We may be sure the young duke understood, and was grateful.

As to the *Troilus*, Mr. Patch is not ready to give it up to medieval romance. A romance it is, to be sure, in frame-work and design and in much of its substance, but it is far more solid than any romance, *Troilus*, *Cressida*, and *Pandarus* are creatures of flesh and blood, straight out of the reality of a play of Shakespeare's or a novel of Fielding's, and the moral earnestness of the poet is not dimmed either by poetic graces or the hearty humanity of the love scenes. Mr. Patch is right here to follow Mr. Lewis or Professor Karl Young without a sharp corrective from Professor Kittredge's great essay is to lose sight of what really matters. And I agree heartily that Chaucer was too good an artist to lose himself in the paradoxes of determinism. "As a man soweth, so shall he also reap."

For most people, however, Chaucer is the poet of the *Canterbury Tales*. And they are right, for in this glorious company of *nonpareils* and the stories they tell, his genius came to full fruition. Mr. Patch does not fall short of his great argument. For all that has been written on this grateful subject from Dryden to Kittredge and Lowes, he can still write about it with freshness and originality. It is true, to take only one example, that there is in this matchless *comédie humaine* an almost mystic absorption in men and women, an understanding of them deeper than mere artistic intuition. That is why he likes them all; all, thinks Mr. Patch,

save the Pardoner, who lives in an "isolation which is Hell." Perhaps he did, but I am unwilling to admit that Chaucer disliked even him. At all events I am sure that he admired him; for who can fail to admire the skill of that consummate artist? If Chaucer actually thought of him as a eunuch *ex nativitate*, perhaps he did feel repelled, but I doubt even that. The one thing I feel sure about is that Geoffrey Chaucer was tremendously proud of his brain-child and took an infinite pleasure in him. If I believed the contrary I should feel that he was almost as bad a critic of his own work as William Wordsworth, and as destitute of humor.

Lovers of Chaucer, and thanks to teachers like Mr. Patch they are increasingly numerous, will welcome this excellent little book for the best of all reasons, that it will send them back to Chaucer once more, and that, I fancy, is the first business of the critic.

MARTIN B. RUUD

The University of Minnesota

Nuovi Canti Carnascialeschi del Rinascimento, edited by CHARLES S SINGLETON. Istituto di Filologia Romanza della R. Università di Roma. Modena, 1940 Pp. 174.

Mr. Singleton now adds further songs to the volume of *Canti carnascialeschi del Rinascimento* which he published in *Scrittori d'Italia* in 1936. The present volume consists of a preface, the text of ninety-three songs, a glossary (13 pp.), and an index of the first lines of all the *canti carnascialeschi*, printed and unprinted, known to the editor; proper information on manuscripts and editions is included. At the head of each song is given a list of the manuscripts and printed texts used in forming the present text, in order of their importance.¹ No variant readings are given, but probably they would be of too little service to justify themselves. The music is not dealt with, but in the index are indicated the songs accompanied by music in the manuscripts.

Of the songs printed, seventy are found in *Tutti i Trionfi, . . . o canti Carnascialeschi*, Firenze, 1559. This volume is not easy to obtain; I have seen it on sale in Florence, but not for a song. Nor is the reprint of Lucca, 1750, a common book. Hence Mr. Singleton's volume would be valuable in making texts accessible, even if he had not had recourse to the ms. His improvements on the text of 1750 are great, especially in the preservation of early forms. Comparison with that of 1559 has not been possible to the reviewer. Of the

¹ The abbreviation L² (p. 107) seems to have dropped from the list; according to Mr. Singleton's earlier volume, it means Laurenziano-Ashburnhamiano 606.

twenty-three songs the editor did not find in that volume, a number are fragments.

The preface shows that the songs are in various ways important. First, as a store of words of interest to students of the history of the Italian language, for, if they are to be employed in the making of a historical dictionary of Italian, they must obviously be presented in their true form, and not as corrupted by editors and printers.

But this linguistic history can hardly exist by itself, it depends on the social history of the period, "perché come espressione il canto carnascialesco non si libera mai dalla realtà in cui sorge, e resta ben immerso in questa realtà di occasione, acquistando così valore di documento dove perde valore per la storia della poesia." This may be turned in the other direction to suggest that the student of the masques and entertainments of the time must turn to the songs of the Florentine carnival. In fact it seems that even the masques of Ben Jonson, not to mention the entertainments by Middleton, Heywood, and Webster, can hardly be understood by one who is ignorant of what Inigo Jones presumably saw and heard in Italy, as we may infer it from the drawings of Callot or the carnival songs of Machiavelli, Lorenzo the Magnificent, and the others. The designs of Reubens for the entrance of Ferdinand of Austria into Antwerp in 1635 are surely more immediately intelligible to one who has seen something of what was done in that way in Italy. As Mr. Singleton implies in dealing with Lorenzo as the inventor of the carnival song (p. 7), the traditions of such entertainments were persistent in Italy; moreover what had been seen in Florence was later to be seen in the North.

Turning from the songs in their relation to society, involving an admission that they are *oratoria letteraria* rather than *poesia*, the editor speaks briefly on a linguistic problem of the songs other than those of moral intent, that of the equivocal meaning, "osceno se volete e libidinoso," on which they depend. All teachers of Renaissance literature have seen students not aware of the frequent use of the double meaning fall into the traps it offers, but I have seen stated only by Mr. Singleton that it goes to the bottom of certain literary works, and is more than something incidental, to be recognized by a reader of experience with a little intuition. His promise of further publication on the subject will, I hope, soon be fulfilled; such a study will be illuminating to students of Shakespeare and his day.

The volume is of large format, with wide margins and good type: that give it an excellent appearance and make its use a pleasure.

ALLAN H. GILBERT

Duke University

John Dryden, a Bibliography of Early Editions and of Drydeniana

By HUGH MACDONALD. Oxford The Clarendon Press, 1939.

Pp. x + 358 \$10 00

Mr. Macdonald's work continues notably the efforts of T. J. Wise, Thorn-Drury, P. J. Dobell, and others to provide us with a satisfactory bibliography of Dryden's writings. It goes beyond the aims of its predecessors in proposing to include "every contemporary book or pamphlet" that Mr. Macdonald has been able to trace, in which Dryden is "praised, attacked, or alluded to." Moreover, the footnotes in this book are crammed with valuable information, summing up pertinent biographical facts and listing the more important scholarly studies that bear upon the poet's life and his various works. The notes are especially useful for the dates which Luttrell and other contemporaries jotted down on their own copies, and for dates garnered from advertisements in contemporary periodicals. The very considerable pains which he has given to the task should assure Mr. Macdonald of the gratitude of all who are interested in Dryden.

In spite of the positive merits of this work, it would be a grave error to assume that the problems of Dryden bibliography are now solved. Relatively unimportant is the fact that in a few instances Mr. Macdonald did not bother to examine copies of editions that were known to exist but were not readily available. Thus he did not see the edition of *Absalom and Achitophel* which he lists as 12 c, although there are copies in Trinity College, Dublin, and in the Huntington and the William Andrews Clark libraries, and as a result, the item is listed out of its chronological order, even a hasty examination indicating that it belongs somewhere after 12 e. Of much greater importance is the fact that few, and often no distinguishing features are given concerning the edition or issue listed (this is especially true of later printings of each work), and the result is confusion. For example, the Clark Library possesses a copy of a 1704 edition of *The Spanish Fryar* with a title-page different from that of the copy which Mr. Macdonald lists and partly describes as item 86 e, from his inadequate description it is impossible to determine whether the Clark copy represents a different edition or merely another issue with a new title-page. Again, to cite another example, Mr. Macdonald lists two editions of *The Indian Emperour* dated 1696 with no mention of variations. Of this play the Clark Library holds copies of three distinct editions dated 1696. On the basis of the scant information given in the *Bibliography* one cannot tell whether any one of the editions represented by the Clark copies resembles any of the editions which Mr. Macdonald saw, consequently there may be, so far as we know, three, or four, or five separate editions printed in 1696. Future bibli-

ographers will have the task of finding out, and they will have to start from the beginning. The direction (p 94) that we consult the Scott-Saintsbury and the Montague Summeis' editions for information concerning changes made in successive printings of a work seems to come short of the fulfillment of a bibliographer's duty. What Mr. Macdonald has done himself appears to have been done with commendable accuracy, but he has not done enough. The definitive bibliography of Dryden will be based on an examination of many more copies of each work than Mr. Macdonald has seen, and it cannot be done without consulting some of the great Dryden collections in America—a task now made comparatively easy and inexpensive through the use of microfilm. The bibliography will include the distinguishing features of each edition and issue, and will give us reasonably full information concerning the successive changes made in the printings of each work, it will give us sufficiently complete details to establish the chronological order of issues, and it will make clear from what text each edition after the second was set up. And it will, we hope, list at least the more important of the editions after 1700 which Mr. Macdonald has not touched.

The section in this *Bibliography* devoted to Drydeniana is an excellent beginning. But the list of items before 1700 is incomplete, and the list after 1700 barely scratches the surface, as Mr. Macdonald notes, the entries after 1700 are "progressively more selective." Notwithstanding these faults, however, Mr. Macdonald's contribution is of great value to Dryden scholars, both as a bibliography and as an allusion book.

E. N. HOOKER

H. T. SWEDENBERG, JR

University of California
at Los Angeles

Der deutsche Dichter um die Jahrhundertwende und seine Abgelöstheit von der Gesellschaft, von HANS WILHELM ROSENHAUPT. Sprache und Dichtung, Heft 66. Bern-Leipzig 1939. Paul Haupt. Pp. 287. Geheftet Fr. 9.—

Der Verfasser sucht die Literatur seit 1890 unter den Gesichtspunkt der Gesamtproblematik unserer Zeit zu rücken. Als charakteristisch für die letzten fünfzig Jahre sieht er den Verfall der kleinen Organismen der Nation und der Klasse sowie die Entwicklung großräumiger Zusammenfassungen an. Er sieht die Krise der Zeit in dem Widerspruch zwischen praktisch-technischer Erweiterung zum Großraum und der geistigen Gewohnheit, sich in kleinen und kleinsten Räumen zu bewegen, also nicht mensch-

heitlich, sondern eng national und regional zu denken und zu fühlen

Auf diesem allgemeinen, kuisenhaften Hintergrund baut sich Rosenhaupts Untersuchung auf. Der Dichter dieser Zeit fühlt sich im Gegensatz zu einem engen, materialistisch gesinnten Bürgertum, dem jedes verbindliche Wertsystem abhanden gekommen ist. Er verliert in einer sich auflösenden Gesellschaft jede Funktion und zieht sich beruflich und künstlerisch in die Einsamkeit seines Ich zurück. Die Dichtung wird richtungslose Kritik, beziehungs- und verantwortungsloser Traum; stückhafte Konzentration auf die Einzeldinge, Auflösung des Kausalnexus, Gestaltung des Unheimlichen, des Dämonischen, der Bereiche zwischen Traum und Wirklichkeit. Der Dichter sucht sich von den Bindungen zu trennen, die er als schlecht erkannt hat, und flüchtet in ein Reich des künstlerischen, verpflichtungslosen Scheins, in dem er willenlos die Auflösung ins Nichts ersehnt. Soweit die Ablösung von der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft erst von dem einzelnen Dichter vollzogen wird, wird seine Dichtung kritisch, ironisch oder zynisch, nach der Ablösung wird der Dichter zum unproduktiven Prediger und Lehrer; nur in Ausnahmefällen sucht er ein neues Ziel zu gestalten, das sich aber in vagen und unüberzeugenden Umrissen halt

Dieses allgemeine Zeitbild wird vom Verfasser mit einer großen Anzahl von Beispielen aus den Werken, namentlich der Naturalisten und Impressionisten, illustriert und wahrscheinlich gemacht. Dabei werden eine Reihe von Problemen aufgewiesen, die einer näheren Untersuchung bedürfen. Der Verfasser tritt durchaus nicht mit dem Anspruch auf, eine abschließende Untersuchung zu geben, und ist sich vollkommen bewußt, daß seine Methode Zweifel und Diskussion herausfordern wird. Es geschieht also mit voller Anerkennung seiner Leistung und seines Verdienstes um die geisteswissenschaftliche Deutung eines Zeitphänomens, wenn ich hier einige kritische Bemerkungen anfüge. Diese beschränken sich mit Absicht auf seine Grundposition, da sich hieraus die wichtigsten Folgerungen für die Gesamtuntersuchung von selbst ergeben. Die fundamentale Krise unserer Zeit scheint mir richtig darin angedeutet, daß wir uns von der kleinräumigen zur großräumigen Auffassung des Menschen bewegen. Die Lösung aber scheint mir nicht einfach in der großräumigen, also menschheitlichen Auffassung zu liegen, sondern eher in einer Synthese, in der der engere Kreis nationaler Kulturen mit einem technisch-ökonomischen Internationalismus zusammenbestehen können und die Nationen sich in größerer Freiheit auf ihre Eigenwerte besinnen können, während sie sich—wie der Verfasser richtig sieht—in den letzten Jahrzehnten vom Technisch-ökonomischen in eine geistige Wüste haben treiben lassen. Eine solche Betrachtung wurde meines Erachtens den gegensätzlichen Tendenzen, die der Verfasser als Leben und Geist bezeichnet, besser gerecht werden können, und der Gefahr einer zu großen Vereinfachung des Bildes dieser

Periode vorbeugen. Auf Grund einer solchen Polarität und der entsprechenden synthetischen Gesamttenenz ließe sich auch das hier etwas statisch erscheinende Gesamtbild mehr als in der Entwicklung begriffen und wenigstens unbewußt zielstrebig deuten.

Oberlin College

F. W. KAUFMANN

Aristotelean Papers, Revised and Reprinted. By LANE COOPER.
Ithaca Cornell University Press, 1939. Pp. x + 237. \$2.50.

In this volume Professor Cooper has brought together eight articles and ten reviews which he has published in various periodicals during the last thirty years. In his preface he expresses the hope that the several papers will give support to one another, that republication will save them from "gathering oblivion," and that his pupils and in turn their pupils will welcome the book. Cooper is completely justified in giving the title 'Aristotelean' to the group of studies, inasmuch as they all give palpable evidence of their explicit or implicit relation to the Greek philosopher.

Of the articles, "The Fifth Form of 'Discovery' in the *Poetics* (1455a12-16)," "A Pun in the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle (1412a32-b2)," and "Haemon and Jocasta Advising (1417b16-20)" offer convincing new interpretations for three difficult passages in Aristotle. The article on "The Verbal 'Ornament'" (*Poetics* 1457b2) seems less happy in its method and in its conclusions. After citing many illustrations of verbal ornament, Cooper (p. 120) says confidently that the reader will agree that "any word that is ornamental, whether adjective or noun or verb or adverb, is an ornamental word!" Possibly this statement may elucidate the passage in Aristotle, but one could scarcely deny that it leaves the basic issue concerning the nature of verbal ornament pretty well undisturbed.

The reviews, which are often themselves really independent papers, are more interesting than the articles. In many of them there is a correct insistence upon the value of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and its importance for the interpretation of the *Poetics*. Cooper repeatedly warns the reader against the translation and critical essays of Butcher, which he believes (and rightly) to have exerted a most unfortunate influence upon English students and scholars in their understanding of the *Poetics*. The author has a profound admiration for the work of Gudeman, Bywater, Rhys Roberts, and Ross, but is particularly scathing in his critical estimate of Fyfe's version of the *Poetics* in the Loeb Classical Library.

Students of English literature will be especially interested in the article on "Some Wordsworthian Similes," and in the review, on

the whole unfavorable, of Lowes' *The Road to Xanadu*. In conclusion, one is tempted to wish that Cooper had not held so strictly to his fundamentally untenable view (expressed on p. 83, cf. p. 219), that it is nonsense to believe that one need to know Aristotle's *Physics* and *Metaphysics*, for example, in order to read his *Poetics* with intelligence. What does Cooper mean by "with intelligence"?

WHITNEY J. OATES

Princeton University

BRIEF MENTION

Die nationale Literatur Schottlands von den Anfängen bis zur Renaissance. Von F. BRIE Halle (Saale) Max Niemeyer 1937. Pp. xiv, 371 RM 14 The title of this interesting and important investigation does not mean what an Anglo-Saxon might take it to mean: the author uses *national* in a restricted sense, answering to our 'nationalistic' or 'patriotic,' and his book is a study of Scottish patriotic feeling as reflected in early Scottish literature. Here the first great work, of course, was Barbour's *Bruce*, but Brie devotes his first chapter to the signs of patriotic feeling to be found before Barbour, with special attention to Fordun. He next considers Wyntoun's chronicle, its continuation by Wyntoun's anonymous friend, and Wyntoun's own continuation of his friend's work (or, if you prefer, resumption of his original chronicle). He then takes up the *Scotichronicon* of Walter Bower and the *Relaciones* of Blair. The eighth chapter, the longest in the book, deals with the anonymous *Wallace*. The last two chapters are concerned with John Major's *Historia* and Hector Boece's *Scotorum Historia*. There follows a section of eight pages, called *Schluss* but actually devoted to another subject, namely, the rise of *English* national feeling, in connexion with which the *Complaynt of Scotlande* is briefly considered. By "Schluss" the author apparently means the end, not of the book but of the first great period of Scottish patriotic literature; he connects this end (rightly, no doubt) with the union of England and Scotland under one ruler, a union which cast its shadows back into the sixteenth century, and served to dilute a patriotism based primarily on hatred of the English oppressor. An appendix deals with the supposed *Bruce* of Peter Fenton, the author comes to a negative conclusion. Brie shows throughout his mastery of the materials. I have noted misprints on pp. 52, 75, 134, 317 and 321.

K. M.

The Poet's Work. By JOHN HOLMES New York: Oxford University Press, 1939 Pp. xvii + 186 \$2.00 Anthologies, paradoxically enough, are frequently as personal as are creative works. So it is with Mr. Holmes' collection of passages about poetry—a collection that reveals the compiler as a man of subtle and catholic taste, with no too apparent a critical axe to grind. The book is divided into five sections, each prefaced by a short essay. The selections chosen would seem to be of two kinds: those in which critics or poets give their conceptions as to the words, knowledge, difficulties, world and nature of the poet; and those in which the writers are shown illustrating the precepts. Mr. Holmes' book will find its chief usefulness, as he suggests, in its power to exhilarate the creative mind, particularly the young creative mind. For the more mature his selections are too limited in critical scope and too merely inspirational to be really satisfactory. Which is, perhaps, only to say that each of us must compile his own anthology.

LOUIS TEETER

The Johns Hopkins University

Studies in Literary Types in Seventeenth Century America (1607-1710). By JOSEPHINE K. PIERCY New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939 Pp. xvi + 360 \$3.50. Miss Piercy has examined the surface of seventeenth century American literature with interest if not with understanding and has classified her observations under the headings "Literary Types" and "Influences." The descriptive first part includes a number of names and titles not mentioned by Moses C. Tyler, and it may be of some use as an elementary guide to the literature of the period. Unfortunately, however, Miss Piercy's intellectual innocence and lack of scholarship disqualify her as an interpreter of the seventeenth century, and she is sometimes (for example, the chapter on "The Classical Inheritance" in part II) as misleading as possible in her discussion. Eighty-two pages of printed appendices and twelve of facsimile make available rare material, mostly from early almanacs, and form the most valuable portion of the book.

LEON HOWARD

Northwestern University

A History of Esthetics. By KATHARINE EVERETT GILBERT and HELMUT KUHN. New York: Macmillan, 1939 Pp. xx + 582. \$4.25. There can be no question that this new history of theories of beauty will become for the time being the standard work of reference, superseding Bosanquet's. The work of the English Neo-Hegelian, though copious in formation, was written almost fifty years ago and was unfortunately so thoroughly impregnated with

the metaphysical spirit that one never knew when reading it whether one was reading history or aesthetics. The authors of this new history of aesthetics not only write more clearly but with more detachment from special bias. The period covered extends from ancient Greek time to the close of the nineteenth century. The last chapter on *Esthetics and Art in Our Time* is in no way comparable to the earlier parts of the book, being merely a sort of catalogue of "others present".

It is customary in reviews to point out weakness as well as strength. The weakness, as the writer of this notice sees it, lies in the fifth chapter on medieval aesthetics. Though it is true that the number of special treatises on beauty and the arts is negligible during this period, the practice of artists and the conditions under which they worked give us some clue to what many people between Saint Augustine and Saint Thomas thought were the aim of art and possibly the nature of beauty. To follow such clues is dangerous and often futile, and writers may easily be forgiven for not attempting to do so. With this one exception, the book may be highly recommended to scholars who wish guidance in the field it covers.

GEORGE BOAS

The Johns Hopkins University

CORRESPONDENCE

IS CHAUCER'S MONK A MONK? Professor Kuhl (*MLN.*, LV, 480) questions two statements in my small article in the May number. The word "monk" to be sure has been and is often used loosely, but Chaucer shows elsewhere that he knew the difference between a monk and a canon even in their daily costume, and as I said daily passed both on the street. His bodily guided his inward eye. Mr Kuhl ignores this chief point, which is valid without evidence to the contrary. Secondly, of course Edward the Confessor had long been a well-known saint and also historic figure, especially in connection with constitution and government, with law and the sovereign. Mr. Kuhl's cases (though not at all proving him specially prominent) thoroughly illustrate this official character, the reason for which was that Edward was the last Anglo-Saxon king who had really reigned, and the last if not the only king of England to be canonized. No wonder a saint-king was highly regarded. Doubtless the conspicuous site of his shrine gave him also popular familiarity. But all this had been true for centuries, and many illustrations of vogue could be found for many other saints. My condensed phrase "not a specially prominent saint in the fourteenth century" is not incorrect.

J. S. P. TATLOCK

University of California at Berkeley

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received]

Andrew, S. O.—Syntax and style in Old English. *Cambridge*. University Press [New York: Macmillan], 1940. Pp. viii + 112. \$2 50

Ashton, John W. (ed.)—Types of English drama. *New York*. Macmillan, 1940. Pp. xii + 750. \$1 50 (Types of English Literature)

Bridges, Robert and Bradley, Henry.—Correspondence, 1900-1923. *Oxford*. Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford U. Press], 1940. Pp. vi + 191. \$2 75

Brown, Herbert R.—The sentimental novel in America, 1789-1860. *Durham, N. C.*: Duke U. Press, 1940. Pp. x + 407. \$3 00.

Collins, Joseph B.—Christian mysticism in the Elizabethan age, with its background in mystical methodology. *Baltimore, Md.*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1940. Pp. xvi + 251. \$3 25.

Criswell, Elijah H.—Lewis and Clark linguistic pioneers. *Columbia, Mo.*: U of Missouri, 1940. Pp. ccxii + 102. \$1 25. (University of Mo Studies, XV, 2)

Davis, Herbert, De Vane, William C., and Bald, R. C.—(coll. and ed.).—Nineteenth-century studies, a collection of essays on S. T. Coleridge, Lord Byron, Thomas Carlyle, Robert Browning, John Ruskin, William Morris, and Samuel Butler. *Ithaca, N. Y.*: Cornell U. Press, 1940. Pp. x + 303. \$3 00

Earnest, Ernest.—John and William Bartram, botanists and explorers, 1699-1777, 1739-1823. *Philadelphia, Pa.*: U. of Pa. Press, 1940. Pp. viii + 187. \$2 00 (Pennsylvania Lives)

Gordan, John D.—Joseph Conrad, the making of a novelist. *Cambridge, Mass.*: Harvard U. Press, 1940. Pp. xiv + 430. \$4 00.

Gover, J. E. B., Mawer, Allen, and Stenton, F. M.—The place-names of Nottinghamshire. *Cambridge*: University Press [New York: Macmillan], 1940. Pp. xlii + 348. \$5 90 (English Place-Name Society, xvi)

—The place-names of Wiltshire. *Cambridge*: University Press [New York: Macmillan], 1939. Pp. xlii + 547. \$6 50. (English Place-Name Society, xv)

Hart, Archibald and Lejeune, F. Arnold.—The growing vocabulary, fun and adventure with words. *New York*. Dutton, 1940. Pp. 126. \$1 00.

Kirk, Rudolf and Clara M. (eds.).—Types of English poetry. *New York*: Macmillan,

1940. Pp. xxvi + 663. \$1 50. (Types of English Literature)

McHale, Carlos F.—An injustice of human memory, a defense of the greatest English lexicographer. *New York*. privately printed, 1938. Pp. 16

Odell, George C. D.—Annals of the New York stage, vol. xii [1882-1885]. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1940. Pp. xx + 734. \$8 75

Poepping, Hilde—James Stephens. *Halle*: Max Niemeyer, 1940. Pp. iv + 101. M 3 50 (Deutschen Gesellschaft für keltische Studien, 4)

Quinn, Arthur Hobson (ed.).—The early plays of James A. Herne, with Act IV of *Griffith Davenport*. *Princeton, N. J.*: Princeton U. Press, 1940. Pp. x + 160. \$5 00. (America's Lost Plays, vii.)

Shanley, James L.—A study of Spenser's gentleman. *Evanston, Ill.*: Northwestern U., 1940. Pp. vi + 55. Princeton diss.

Shuster, George N.—The English ode from Milton to Keats. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1940. Pp. viii + 314. \$3 00 (Columbia U. Studies in Eng. and Comp. Lit., 150.)

Sisson, C. J.—The judicious marriage of Mr. Hooker and the birth of *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. *Cambridge*: University Press [New York: Macmillan], 1940. Pp. xvi + 203. \$2 50

Wildman, John H.—Anthony Trollope's England. *Providence, R. I.*: Brown U., 1940. Pp. x + 135. \$2 00. (Brown U. Studies, v.)

GERMAN

Adler, Norbert.—Die Architektur im Werke Josef Pontens. *Diss. Bonn*: Kollen-Verl. 1939. 95 pp.

Adriani, Bruno.—Baudelaire und George. (1-2. Tausend). *Berlin*: U. Riemerschmidt Verl. [1939]. 67 pp. M. 2 50.

Aurora. Ein romantischer Almanach. Jahressgabe der Deutschen Eichendorff-Stiftung. Begründet von Karl Frh. von Eichendorff. Hrsg. von Karl Szodrok. *Oppeln*: Verl. "Der Oberschlesier," 1940. 62 pp. 3 plates. M. 1 50

Bamler, Friedrich.—Ahnentafel des Dichters Jean Paul (Friedrich Richter) [Stamm- und Ahnentafel der Zentralstelle für deutsche Personen- und Familiengeschichte 18, 10]. *Leipzig*: Zentralstelle f. dt. Personen- u. Familiengeschichte, 1940. 8 pp. 4°. M. 2

Baumgartner, Heinrich.—Die Schi-Sprache. Das Werden einer Sondersprache. [Aus: Schweizer. Archiv für Volkskunde Bd. 32, H. 3]. *Basel*. Schweizer. Ges. f. Volkskunde, 1933. 20 pp.

Becker, Horst.—Sächsische Mundartenkunde. Entstehung, Geschichte u. Lautstand

der Mundarten Sachsens u Nordböhmens
Mit 18 Karten *Dresden v Baensch* [1939]
172 pp M 5 80

Berron, Gottfried.—Der Heland als Kunst-
werk 4 Studien Diss Tübingen *Würzburg* ·
Tiltsch, 1940 93 pp M 3

Bertram, Johannes — Goethes Faust im
Blickfeld des XX Jahrhunderts Eine welt-
anschauliche Deutung *Hamburg-Altona* ·
Dreizack-Verl [1939] 368 pp M 8

Brentano, Clemens — Briefwechsel zwischen
Clemens Brentano und Sophie Mereau Nach
den Hss hrsg von Heinz Amelung Neue
Ausg mit 8 Bildtafeln *Potsdam* Rutten &
Loening, 1939 468 pp M 8 50

Bruschius, Caspar — Des Humanisten Cas-
par Bruschius Lobgedicht auf die Stadt Linz
(*Encomium Linzianae civitatis in Austria
super Anasum sitae*) In freier metrischer
Überrtragung von Di Johann Ilg *Linz*.
Muck [1939] 19 pp 50 Pf

Butzler, Carl — Untersuchungen zu den
Melodien Waltheis von der Vogelweide Diss
[Deutsche Arbeiten d Univ Köln 12] *Jena*
Diederichs [1940]. 112 pp, 3 facsimiles
M 6

Christ, Salome.—Jacob Burckhard und die
Poesie der Italiener Diss [Basler Beiträge
zur Geschichtswissenschaft Bd 3] *Basel*.
Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1940 208 pp M 3 90

Cornelius, Eva.—Das epische und drama-
tische Schaffen Ludwig Thomas Diss *Bres-
lau* Genossenschafts-Buchdr 1939 77 pp

Daube, Anna — Der Aufstieg der Mutter-
sprache im deutschen Denken des 15 u 16
Jhs Diss Rostock [Deutsche Forschungen
Bd 34] *Frankfurt a M* · Diesterweg, 1940
77 pp M 3 20

Dierks, Margarete — Die preussischen Alt-
konsekrativen und die Judenfrage 1810-1847
Diss [Rostocker Studien H 7] *Rostock*
Hinshelwood [1939] 179 pp M 3

Engelhardt, Ewald — Die Reichsfreiherrn
Hans und Ernst v Wolzogen, ihr Verhältnis
zu Kalbsriedth und Nordthuringen [*Arten:*]
1939 37 pp 4°

Fauteck, Heinrich — Die Sprachtheorie Fl.
v Hardenbergs [Novals] Diss Göttingen
[Neue Forschung 34] *Berlin*. Junker u
Dunhaupt, 1940 206 pp M 9

Frederking, Christian. — Plattdeutsches
Dorfworterbuch des Dorfes Hahlen bei
Minden in Westfalen. Wortschatz, Spruch-
weisheit, Volkskunde *Bielefeld u Leipzig*
Velhagen & Klasing [1939]. viii, 186 pp
M 4 50

Goethes Egmont-Handschrift Hrsg im
Auftrag der Deutsch-Niederlandischen Ges
von Wilhelm Hansen Mit dem Facsimile
einer Niederschrift Beethovens aus seiner
Egmontmusik *Berlin*: Maximilian-Verl.
[1939] 25 pp, 82 plates, 4°. M. 40.

Gotz, Josef — Die Entwicklung des Wolf
rambildes von Bodmer bis zum Tode Lach-
manns in der germanistischen und schönen
Literatur Diss *Freiburg i B* *Endingen*
Wild, 1940 113 pp

Gottschalk, Hanns — Strachwitz und die
Entwicklung der heldischen Ballade Diss
Breslau *Würzburg* K Tiltsch, 1939 95 pp

Grandt, Broder — Das Flurnamengut des
Kuchspiels Joldelund in Mittelschleswig Ein
Beitrag zur Methodik der Flurnamen-
forschung Diss *Kiel* [Schriften zur Volks-
forschung Schleswig-Holsteins Bd 3] *Flens-
burg* Verl Heimat u Erbe, 1939 128 pp.
1 map M 7 50

Greiner, Trudi — Der literarische Verkehr
zwischen der deutschen und welschen Schweiz
seit 1848 [Sprache u Dichtung H 67] *Bern*
Haupt, 1940 Fr. 10

Greyerz, Otto von, zum Gedächtnis (1863-
1940) *Bern* Francke, 1940 32 pp, 2 plates
M 1 35

Grohl, Richard — Joseph von Eichendorff
[Katholische Christen Bdch 14] *Breslau*
Franko, 1940 51 pp 30 Pf

Hagboldt, Peter — The Teaching of Ger-
man *Boston* · D C Heath & Co [1940] ix,
306 pp \$2 40

Heckel, Theodor — Ernst Moritz Arndt
Ein Mannesleben für Glaube und Volkstum
(Vortrag) [Der Heland H 63] *Berlin*
Verl d Evang Bundes 1939 16 pp 20 Pf

Hermann, Ernst. — Die Inschrift des Brak-
kenseils Wandlungen der hofischen Weltan-
schauung im Jüngeren Titulrel Diss *Man-
burg* Bauer, 1939 vi, 61 pp

Herzog, Rudolf — Rudolf Herzog 70 Jahre
6 Dez 1869-1939 [*Berlin*: Vier Falken Verl
1939] 8 leaves

Klatt, Fritz — Sieg über die Angst Die
Weltangst des modernen Menschen und ihre
Überwindung durch Rainer Maria Rilke *Ber-
lin* L Schneider, 1940 107 pp M 2 25

Koch, Franz — Geschichte deutscher Dich-
tung 3 erw Aufl *Hamburg*: Hanseat. Verl
Anst. [1940] 371 pp M 6 50

Köhler, Ernst. — Die Balladendichtung im
Berliner "Tunnel über der Spree." Diss
[Germanische Studien. H 223]. *Berlin*
Ebering, 1940 423 pp M. 16 20.

Kommerell, Max. — Geist und Buchstabe
der Dichtung Goethe, Kleist, Holderlin
Frankfurt a M : Klostermann [1940]. 294
pp M 6

Koster, Rudolf. — Karl der Grosse als
politische Gestalt in der Dichtung des deut-
schen Mittelalters, Diss [Hansische For-
schungen 2]. *Hamburg* · Hamb. Verl. Anst
Wachholtz, 1939 129 pp M. 5

Kosch, Wilhelm. — Luise Freim von Eichen-
dorff in ihren Briefen an Adalbert Stifter.

[Deutsche Quellen und Studien Bd 14] *Wurzburg*: Wachter-Verl 1940 31 pp M. 4

Kruger, Wolfgang.—Kleist und das Problem der Wahrheit Diss. Göttingen *Königsberg*: 1939 51 pp.

Langer, Norbert.—Die deutsche Dichtung seit dem Weltkrieg Von Paul Ernst bis Hans Baumann *Leipzig*: Kraft [1940] 366 pp M 8.50

Leue, Johannes.—Hofisches in "Van den vos Reinaerde." Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der ritterlichen Elemente in der niederländischen Literatur Diss Bonn. *Wurzburg*. Mayr, 1939 63 pp

Luther, Arthur.—Deutsche Geschichte in deutscher Erzählung Ein literarisches Lexikon. *Leipzig* Hiersemann, 1940 xi, 426 cols. M 9.50

Ninck, Johannes.—Das Riecke [Friederike Kerner] Ein Frauenbild der schwabischen Romantik 3 Aufl Mit 7 Abb *Leipzig*: Schloessmann [1939] 87 pp M 2

Orell, Bertha von.—Betsy Meyer, die Schwester Conrad Ferdinand Meyers. *Zürich* Rascher [1940] 47 pp 55 Pf

Ott, Hanns—Personengestaltung im geistlichen Drama des Mittelalters Diss Bonn Kollen, 1939 159 pp

Paur-Ulrich, Marguerite.—Johanna Spyri 1827-1901 *Zürich*. Rascher [1940] 19 pp 55 Pf

Pertz, Susanna—Das Wort "Nordisch" Seine Geschichte bis zur Jahrhundertwende Diss Leipzig *Dresden* Dittert, 1939 72 pp M 2.40

Rehmet, Gisela.—Schleswig-holsteinische Erzählungskunst um 1900 und ihre Beziehung zur Bauernichtung der Gegenwart. Johann Hinrich Fehrs und Timm Kroger Diss *Breslau*: Kleinert, 1939 67 pp

Rilke, Rainer Maria—Gesammelte Briefe [Neue Ausg.] In 6 Banden Hrsg von Ruth Sieber-Rilke und Carl Sieber. [*Leipzig*: Insel-Verl 1936-39] 6 vols, M 40

Scheffel, Joseph Viktor von.—"Mein Glück will mir nicht glücken" Scheffels Briefe ins Elternhaus 1856/57 Im Auftrag des Deutschen Scheffel-Bundes im Reichswerk Buch u Volk eingeleit u hrsg. von Dr Wilhelm Zentner [Gabe des Deutschen Scheffelbundes an s Mitgheder 15] *Karlsruhe* 1939 xxviii, 67 pp

Schmid, Peter.—Georg Buchner Versuch über die tragische Existenz *Bern* Haupt, 1940 124 pp. Fr 4.

Schmidt, Paul.—Beiträge zur Lehre von der Bedeutungsbildung in den indogerm. Sprachen Eine strukturspsychologische Untersuchung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Ganzheitsbedeutungen Diss Kiel. [Aus: Archiv f. d. ges Psychologie 104]. *Leipzig*: Akad. Verlagsges. 1939 Pp 579-637.

Schroder, Edward.—Bachnamen und Siedlungsnamen in ihrem Verhältnis zu einander [Nachrichten von d. Ges d Wiss zu Göttingen. Philol-hist Kl Fachgr 4, N F Bd 3, Nr 1] *Göttingen*: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1940 15 p M 0.60

Siebenschein, Hugo.—Deutscher Humor in der Aufklärung *Praha*: Orbis, 1939 166 pp KČ 30

Sponagel, Ludwig.—Konrad Celtis und das deutsche Nationalbewusstsein Diss Heidelberg [Bausteine zur Volkskunde u. Religionswissenschaft H 18] *Buhl*: Konkordia, 1939 100 pp M 4.80

Storm, Theodor.—Blätter der Freundschaft. Aus dem Briefwechsel zwischen Theodor Storm und Ludwig Pietsch. Mitgeteilt von Volquart Pauls *Heide* Westholsteinische Verlagsanstalt u Verlagsdruckerei [1939] 271 pp, 4 plates, M 6

Temborius, Heinrich.—Alte unermessbare Tage Das Leben des jungen Morike. (Mit 21 zeitgenössischen Abbildungen). *Königsberg*: Kanter-Verl [1939]. 271 pp. M. 6.50

Tysko, Oskar.—Beiträge zu den Flugschriften Lazari Spenglers Diss [Gressener Beiträge zur dt Philologie 71]. *Gressen*: von Munchow, 1939 226 pp M 7

Woelker, Eva-Maria—Menschengestaltung in vorhofischen Epen des 12 Jahrhunderts. Chanson de Roland, Rolandshied des Pfaffen Konrad, König Rother Diss Leipzig. [Germanische Studien H 221]. *Berlin* Ebering, 1940 285 pp M 11.40

Wutzky, Anna Charlotte.—Grillparzer und die Musik [Von deutscher Musik Bd. 23]. *Regensburg*: Bosse [1940]. 125 pp 7 plates. M 0.90

Zech, Wilhelm.—Volkskundliches bei Ludwig Achim von Arnim Diss *Breslau*: Mischkowsky, 1940. 123 pp

Zollinger, Gustav—Wie wurden altdeutsche Personennamen zu Familiennamen? —Auf altgermanischen Glauben und Kult bezugliche Personennamen. [Veröffentlichungen d Schweizer Ges f Familienforschung. Reihe 1, H 7] *Bern*: Schweizer Ges. f Familienforschung, 1939 64 pp Fr. 4

FRENCH

Bastian, Maurice.—Mme de Staël en Allemagne, d'après des docs nouveaux *Geneva*: Rennes-Paris, 1939. 34 pp.

Bowen, Ray P.—The Dramatic Construction of B's Novels. *Eugene*: Univ. of Oregon, 1940 vi + 128 pp.

Buchanan, M. D. W.—Les Sentiments religieux de V. Hugo de 1825 à 1848. Besançon diss., 1939. 240 pp.

Carré, J.-R.—Consistance de Voltaire le philosophe *Paris*: Boivin, 1938. 108 pp.

Corneille, P. — Cinna, éd. G. Guilbert. *Paris* J de Gigord, 1939 112 pp Fr 2 50.

— Horace, éd. H. Carrière. *Ibid*, 1939 96 pp Fr. 2 50

De Vries, Louis — Fr-Eng Science Dictionary *New York* McGraw-Hill, 1940 546 pp \$3 50

Durry, Marie-Jeanne. — Quelques nouveautés sur Marivaux *Paris* Boivin, 1939 46 pp Fr. 8

Eddy, Struble, Cochran, Williams — Basic French (*Mme Thérèse, les Trois Mousquetaires* etc.), II *Boston*: Heath, 1940 xx + 656 pp \$1 92

Flaubert, G. — L'Education sentimentale, éd A Lœwel *Paris* Eds de Cluny, 1939 xvi + 480 pp Fr 15

Frame, D M. — Montaigne in France, 1812-52 *New York* Columbia U Press, 1940 xii + 308 pp \$3 00

Haden and Trotter — Science fr *Boston*: Heath, 1940 vi + 63 pp \$0 48

Humanisme en Alsace, I. *Paris* Belles Lettres, 1939 243 pp Fr 20

Krakowski, Edouard. — La Société parisienne cosmopolite et C K Norwid, peintre et poète précurseur du Symbolisme *Paris* Mercure de France, 1939 223 pp Fr 16 50.

Labiche, E — La Grammaire, éd O F Bond. *Boston* Heath, 1940 i + 60 pp \$0 32

Marguerite de Navarre. — Comédie de la Nativité de Jésus-Christ, éd Jourda *Paris*: Boivin, 1939 108 pp Fr 12.

Maulnier, Thierry. — Introd à la poésie fr *Paris*: Gallimard, 1939 365 pp Fr 30

Mongrédien. — Les Précieux et les précieuses Textes choisis *Paris* Mercure de France, 1939. 352 pp Fr. 15

Monnier, Henry. — Mémoires de M Joseph Prud'homme, éd F. Fleuret *Paris* Mercure de France, 1939 461 pp. Fr. 18

Nerval, Gérard de. — Des inédits Introd de Gisèle Marie *Paris*: Mercure de France, 1939 245 pp. Fr. 18.

Tanqueray, F. J. — Le Romanesque dans le théâtre de Corneille *Paris*: Boivin, 1939. 79 pp. Fr 12

Wicks, C. B. — Charles-Guillaume Etienne, Dramatist and Publicist (1777-1845) *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1940 130 pp. \$1 25 (J. H. Studies in Romance, 37.)

Will, S. F. — A Bibhog. of American Studies on the Fr Renaissance (1500-1600) *Urbana* U. of Ill., 1940. 151 pp \$1 50

ITALIAN

Comucci, Alberto — Le contrade di Siena e la loro autonomia. Palio, popolani, fantini. *Siena*: Tip. Coop. Ex. Combattenti, 1938. 177 pp. L. 10.

D'Amico, Silvio. — Storia del teatro drammatico. Parte IV. L'Ottocento. *Milano*: Rizzoli, 1940

Dante's Divine Comedy. — Part III "Heaven" American translation by Louis How *New York* The Harbor Press, 1940

Ferrero, G. G. — Prosa illustre dell'Ottocento. *Torino* G B Paravia, 1939

Fortini, Arnaldo — Assisi nel Medio Evo Leggenda, avventure, battaglie Edizioni Roma, 1940 L 50

Gargiulo, Alfredo. — Letteratura italiana del Novecento *Firenze* Le Monnier, 1940

Kallen, Gerhard — Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini als Publizist *Köln* Petrarca-Haus, 1939 100 pp

Landino, Cristoforo. — Carmina omnia Ex codicibus manuscriptorum primum edidit Alexander Perosa "Nuova collezione di testi umanistici inediti o rari della R Scuola Normale di Pisa, n 1" *Florentinae*: L S Olschki, 1939. xlv + 207 pp L 50.

Massa, Gaetano — Civiltà italiana *New York*. Las Americas Publishing Co, 1940 xii + 186 pp \$1 50

— Italian Idioms and Proverbs *New York*: Las Americas Publishing Co, 1940 144 pp \$1 00

— A Guide to Italian Reading. *New York* Las Americas, 1940 16 pp \$0.25

Salvatorelli, Luigi — Sommario della storia d'Italia dai tempi preistorici ai nostri giorni. 2a ediz migliorata ed accresciuta. *Torino*: G Einaudi, 1939. xi + 73 pp.

— A Concise History of Italy, from Prehistoric Times to Our Own Day Translated from the Italian by Bernard Miall. *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1940.

— L'Italia medioevale. Dalle invasioni barbariche agli inizi del secolo XI Storia d'Italia illustrata, vol III *Milano*: Mondadori, 1939 656 pp 30 tav.

Seghe, Giuseppe — 4300 proverbi piemontesi *Torino*: Tip. F Mittone, 1939 140 pp L. 5

Tomba, S. — Manuale per lo studio della lingua italiana all'estero. *Bologna*: L Cappelli, 1940 iv + 300 pp

SPANISH

Jennings, A. C. — A Linguistic Study of the *Cartulario de San Vicente de Oviedo*. *New York*: Vanni, 1940 326 pp

Morley, S. G. and Bruerton, C. — The Chronology of Lope de Vega's comedias *New York*: Modern Lang. Ass., 1940. xiv + 427 pp

Rogers, P. P. — The Spanish Drama Collection in the Oberlin College Library. A Descriptive Catalogue *Oberlin*: Oberlin Coll., 1940. x + 469 pp.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LVI

FEBRUARY, 1941

Number 2

GLOSE SOCIO-LINGUISTIQUE SUR UN USAGE DE *SE DÉFENDRE*

Dans une lettre du front français, publiée par le reporter M. A. J. Liebling, sous le titre "They Defend Themselves," dans le *New Yorker* du 10 février 1940, et qui se lit aujourd'hui comme un anachronisme poignant d'amertume, se trouve, à l'occasion du récit piquant d'une petite fête de Noël dans un fort de la ligne Maginot sous les auspices d'un colonel français, l'observation linguistique suivante :

A soldier then wheeled over a tea wagon holding about twenty bottles—Scotch, port, sherry, and various apéritifs. The Colonel took an obvious pride in his gamut of alcohols, it proved he could "defend himself." The verb "*se défendre*" has acquired a very broad meaning in the French Army; it signifies "getting along." An officer pulls a pair of old socks over his shoes so that he will not slip on the ice; a private meets a stray hen and wrings her neck because otherwise she might fly into Germany; soldiers going on patrol in wooded parts of no man's land set rabbit snares so that on their way back, they may pick up a tasty breakfast—all these expedients are part of the French concept of self-defense. It follows logically that a colonel must defend himself on a grander scale than a subordinate, lest he lose face in this most reasonable of armies.

A la fin de l'article, le colonel en question rabroue un capitaine qui ne trouve pas la guerre dans son état actuel assez sérieuse :

The Colonel, whose chest was covered with campaign ribbons and decorations from 1914-1918, stopped chuckling and looked at the captain steadily. "Sometime you may look back on this evening," he said, "and you will say, 'The days at the fort were the good ones.' What the devil! A fellow has to defend himself."

Cet usage a eu, hélas, la vie courte : la durée en est, fait rare en sémantique, datable : 1^{er} sept. 1939—10 mai 1940. Le même reporter écrit dans le même périodique du 18 mai 1940 :

. the real war—the war on the Western front—had begun [le 10 mai 1940] “Finie la drôle de guerre,” people said to each other with a kind of relief. Even the war in Norway had seemed “drôle,” because it was so remote.

Comme nous verrons plus tard, la vie de *se défendre* est solidaire avec l'expression *drôle de guerre*.

Dans le premier de ces textes, le reporter a bien senti l'ironie de ces plaisirs plutôt matérialistes, qui sont camouflés, dans l'inactivité relative imposée à ce vieux soldat, en actes de défense militaire. On pourrait penser que, puisque la défense de la ligne Maginot n'exigeait pas alors de sacrifices plus graves, toute occupation au front apparaissait aux oisifs comme nécessaire et patriotique: l'élargissement sémantique de *se défendre* serait alors le reflet de la situation sur le vocabulaire: pas de défense véritable, donc toute activité appelée défense: le mot est là, employons-le donc! Il y aurait comme une constance des mots (et des notions) alors que les conditions changent—ainsi on a toujours eu besoin de la notion du danger même, et peut-être précisément aux époques paisibles où le danger ne se présente que rarement, il y aurait le moule d'idées tout fait qu'il faut absolument remplir, rien que pour se donner l'illusion de la bonne guerre,—peut-être aussi une sorte de mauvaise conscience qui voudrait par l'emploi du mot bannir l'idée, intolérable au soldat, qu'il n'y a à proprement dire rien à défendre. Le verbe *se défendre* tout nu, sans allusion aux forces *contre qui* (*de qui*) on se défend, dont se dégage une impression de vigilance de toute heure (= *se défendre contre tout*), serait alors dans cette situation de février 1940 une triste parodie de l'esprit militaire.

Or, toutes ces spéculations psychologiques s'évanouissent dès que le linguiste atteste l'emploi de *se défendre* = ‘se défendre contre tout’ avant cette guerre. J'ai sur l'expression un renseignement de mon ami Albert Dauzat qui m'écrivit le 16 avril 1940:

“Se défendre” = “se débrouiller” etc., paraît récent comme terme militaire. Mais ce n'est que le développement d'emplois analogues déjà anciens.

On complimente quelqu'un d'âge sur sa bonne mine. Il répond “Heu! on se défend” (antérieur à 1914).

“Comment vont vos affaires?” — “Pas merveilleux! Mais enfin, on se défend” (sens développé surtout après 1914). De même un vendeur qui sait se débrouiller. “il se défend”. C'est cette valeur usitée dans les milieux commerciaux qui a dû passer dans l'armée.

C'est donc l'idée du commerçant qui voit sa situation foncièrement *mauvaise*, mais susceptible d'être *un peu* améliorée par ses soins, qui a apporté au langage du front la note de pessimisme militant. Mais, pouvons-nous remonter plus haut?

Le passage suivant datant de 1860 nous renseigne: il se trouve dans le livre de Taine *La Fontaine et ses fables*, là où l'auteur explique les vers de la fable " Il met bas son fagot, il songe à son malheur. Quel plaisir a-t-il eu depuis qu'il est au monde?" etc., par la vie des paysans.

Ils ne pensent pas d'ordinaire, ils souffrent simplement, et font effort d'un air morne. Mais, quand ils pensent, que peuvent-ils voir dans toute leur vie, sinon ce qu'a décrit La Fontaine? "Jamais de repos:" ils se lèvent avant le jour, à trois heures du matin souvent, dans l'aube froide et humide "Point de pain quelquefois" rappelez-vous que souvent ils sont morts de faim sous Louis XIV, et que Mme de Maintenon en 1700 mangea du pain bis. A la veille de la Révolution, en pleine paix, ils gagnaient dix-neuf sous par jour, et le pain était aussi cher qu'aujourd'hui. "Sa femme, ses enfants, les soldats, les impôts, les créanciers et la corvée"; la taille au roi, la dîme au curé, les redevances au seigneur, tous les fardeaux de la société n'étaient que pour lui seul. Maintenant encore il vit à peine, "il se défend," comme disent les paysans des Vosges¹

En note, Taine renvoie à Aimé Seillière, *Au pied du Donon, scènes de moeurs vosgiennes*, livre dont j'ai pu, grâce à l'aide de mon aimable collègue E. Malakis, vérifier la date d'apparition d'après le Catalogue général de la librairie française (Lorenz, Paris 1871, IV, 383): 1^{re} édition 1860, 2^e édition 1861.

Se défendre au sens absolu de 'to get along' est donc, non pas un mot militaire ni datant de cette guerre, mais en dernier lieu un mot *paysan*, attesté au moins depuis 1860 (je n'ai pas réussi à le trouver dans les dictionnaires de patois lorrains qui sont à ma disposition: Haillant, Adam, Jacot, Bloch, Zéligzon, le FEW, si riche quand il s'agit de *Wörter und Sachen*, moins instructif quand il s'agit de nuances de mots relevant de la vie intérieure, ne nous

¹ Les paysans en question auront dit, comme les commerçants de M. Dauzat *On se défend*. C'est le *on* collectiviste remplaçant le *je* (et *nous*) dans le parler paysan et dont j'ai traité dans mes *Aufsätze zur rom. Syntax u. Stylistik* n° 11. Voir maintenant l'article de Tappolet, dans *Mél de lingu. Bally*, qui explique le *je parlons* pour 'je parle' des paysans de Molière et le valaisan *nous suis* 'je suis' par "l'être prudent, soupçonneux" du paysan qui aime cacher son moi derrière la collectivité agricole de sa famille ou de son village.

donne rien non plus) ² Ce mot de paysans, qui conçoivent la vie comme éternelle lutte en défensive, remonte évidemment à l'emploi médiéval de *soi défendre* absolu dans une situation où l'agresseur (ou ses coups) était clairement indiqué

La bataille est aduee endementies
Franc et paien merveilus colps i rendent.
Fierent li un, li altre *se defendent*
Tant' hanste i a fraite e sanglente . . .

(*Ch de R*, v 1396) ³

² Un *défendre* dans deux départements lorrains limitrophes de l'Allemagne, signalé par l'*Atlas linguistique* sur la carte 'bûcher du bois,' est naturellement un *fendre* (aire environnant ces points) + le *dé-* de *débiter*

³ Mlle A Hatcher, dans un travail qui paraîtra sous peu, donne les exemples suivants de *soi défendre*

Cil se deffandent asprement *Eneas* 3730

Dunc se defent Vivien cume ber *Charroi de Nîmes* 1410

et commente ainsi "This verb, in contrast to *soi aseurer*, *soi tenses*, which refer to self-protection that might be considered ignominious (and which, consequently, are regularly negative when referring to heroes *Li quens Rolland mie ne s'aseuret*, *Fiert de l'espier* [*Ch. de Rol* 1321-22]), represents the subject rather as incurring danger, as *fighting* in self-defense. The *cume ber se deffendet* above represents the same idea as the negative *mie ne s'aseuret* it means to make a brave fight, to "put up" a fight. (Note the use of the negative *soi défendre* to refer to the unmilitant behavior of Christ *de totas part presdrent iesum / nos defended ne nos susted / a la mort var cum uns anel* [*passion*, 154-56])"

Mlle Hatcher me fournit encore les exemples suivants montrant que la défensive devient une offensive.

. . cil des nes . . se desfendent a ceus des barges, et se vont entreferant de pierres et de rimes et lancent dars . *Histoire de Cesar* (Jean de Tuum, 13^e s.), p 39

Tant se desfendoit asprement et *cruelment* qu'il faisoit traire arriere et ressortir toute la gent Pompee . *Ibid*, p 96

Donc, dans un passage comme *Erec*, v 5870 ff

Jusqu'a tant que veu aiez . . .
Les mailles de mon haubert blanc
Et mon hiaume fret et quassé
Et moi recieant et lassé
Que plus ne me porrai *defandre*,
Qu'il m'estovra merci atandre
Et deproier outre mon vuel,
Lors porroiz feire vostre duel

le protagoniste envisage probablement sa mise hors de combat sous la forme de "ne pas pouvoir donner et rendre des coups."

Cette nuance offensive en a. fr. est probablement le reste (ou une revivi-

puisque *fierent* est l'activité de l'agresseur à laquelle s'oppose la défensive qui administre les mêmes coups (Bédier: 'L'un attaque, l'autre se défend'). Les coups sont pour ainsi dire 'dans l'air,' l'ennemi n'a pas besoin d'être signalé. Cf. les passages médiévaux cités par Lattîé: *Par tantes foiz an esté assailliz Que je n'ai mais poour de moi deffendre* et *François se defendirent com noble guerrier*, et encore la traduction de Littré (s. v. *défendre*, n°. 7). 'repousser la force par la force.'

Le paysan qui a emprunté au pas d'armes une expression qui chez lui devient synonyme de 'réussir à vivre'⁴ n'est évidemment pas moins pessimiste que le bûcheron de La Fontaine: vivre pour lui, c'est se défendre contre un agresseur toujours prêt à l'assaillir, c'est une lutte de tous les jours contre un ennemi toujours présent, qui, par conséquent, n'a pas besoin d'être nommé. Ce pessimisme paysan a été démontré par M. Marouzeau, le latinisant qui, par la considération des origines rurales de la civilisation romaine, a été amené à écrire un traité "Le parler paysan" (*Bull. de la soc. de lingu.* 1924, 91) il mentionne p. ex. l'habitude du paysan français de répondre à la question sur la qualité de la récolte: *Y en a tout de même*. "Le 'tout de même' répond à sa préoccupation domi-

viscence) de la signification originaire du radical latin *fendere* qui est, selon Ernout-Meillet, 'frapper' (gr *phévos* 'meutre'); *defendere* 'écarter, repousser l'ennemi' (*defendere vim ab aliquo* 'repousser la force d'un ennemi de quelqu'un, qui, de ce fait, est protégé') n'est pas tellement loin à l'origine de *offendere* 'frapper contre' — Pourquoi le fr a-t-il aujourd'hui *défendre* (défense) à côté de *offenser* (offense), alors que le latin connaît et les verbes simples *defendo* — *offendo* et les intensifs *defensare* — *offensare* et que l'a fi avait *defendre* et *ofendre*? Peut-être qu'un faux rapport étymologique avec l'autre verbe *fendre* 'trancher en deux' est venu troubler *offendre* *offenser*, attesté à partir du XIV^e s au sens d' 'attaquer' (Bloch), obviait à l'interprétation de *offendre* comme 'fendie une ligne de combat,' qui n'était plus de mise au temps où grâce à l'arme à feu et à la tactique nouvelle, les combats à la Winkelried étaient devenus désuets. *Offenser* 'attaquer' ne subsiste plus qu'au sens moral, le terme technique italien *attaquer*, insistant sur le 'contact avec l'ennemi,' s'étant arrogé le sens propre. L'angl *to fend off* vient d'un *défendre* au sens 'repousser l'ennemi'

⁴ On pourrait comparer la préoccupation constante des paysans canadiens de Louis Hémon (*Maria Chapdelaine*) "tenir," qui doit aussi être un mot d'origine militaire 'tenir une ligne ou position' (all *durchhalten*), mais qui semble être devenu identique à 'résister aux difficultés en travaillant' l'intransitif devient le signe de la force concentrée.

nante, celle de toujours se plaindre, par principe." On pourrait citer l'évolution sémantique du mot *plaindre* lui-même qui a signifié autrefois 'marchander' (*se plaindre une chose* 's'en passer par avarice'), cf. Stapfer, *Récréations philologiques*, p. 159, et le catal. *plànyer*, arag. *plañir* 'économiser' (REW³, s. v. *plangere*): le paysan économe 'plaint' toute chose qui pourrait lui échapper.

Ce pessimisme n'est naturellement pas l'apanage exclusif du paysan. c'est l'homme en général qui se sent opprimé par le poids de ses expériences négatives, par ce que j'appelais dans le temps "Last des Lebens" (*Zeitschr. f. frz. Spr.* LIV, 48 seq.): je citais des tournures-cliché comme "Encore un qui a de la chance (du toupet)," "C'est encore ce qu'il y a de mieux"—qui font supposer que la règle sur cette terre sublunaire c'est que la chance ou le toupet (et non le mérite) font arriver au succès, que toutes choses ici-bas sont en principe mauvaises (cf. la phrase pittoresque citée par Esnault, *Le Poulx tel qu'il se parle*, p. 568: "Encore un qui a sucé la Tour Eiffel pour la rendre pointue," dit d'un fanfaron)—ainsi que des passages de Duhamel, romancier qui semble avoir été particulièrement sensible au complexe de persécution *in statu nascendi*:

Edouard connut l'amertume du bonheur complet . . . En fait, il vivait dans la crainte: il ne pouvait plus lui arriver que de la peine, puisqu'il était tout à fait heureux. Il avait besoin, pour se rassurer, pour se maintenir dans la région aérienne où il vivait, d'un apport continu de joies et de succès . . . Il eut, un jour, un bref démêlé avec un cousin, au sujet d'un petit héritage. Il reçut du papier timbré, pour la première fois de sa vie, et s'écria d'une voix tragique "Encore une affaire!" (*Deux hommes*, p. 167.)

Ce faisant, je m'aperçus que ce genre de réflexions n'était pas une nouveauté dans ma vie, que j'avais toujours dit ou pensé des choses analogues, bref que le Papou [= le primitif en moi] triomphait depuis longtemps.

Mettais-je un pantalon blanc dès le matin et le ciel venait-il à s'obscurcir, je me surprénais disant à ma femme "J'ai mis un pantalon blanc. Alors, évidemment, il va pleuvoir . . ."

Je découvris que par l'usage même d'une foule de clichés, de lieux communs, j'attribuais à la fatalité des intentions, des méthodes, une *malveillance* et une intelligence humaines. Je disais "La grêle a complètement haché vingt dahlias, et, bien entendu, les vingt plus beaux . . ."

Coupais-je les pages d'un livre? Je me laissais, pendant cette besogne mécanique, glisser à des supputations singulières "Pourvu que je n'en aie pas oublié une! Si j'en ai oublié une seule, il va nous arriver quelque nouveau malheur"

Je m'aperçus que, sous prétexte d'invoquer l'expérience, je prononçais vingt fois par jour toutes sortes de phrases telles que: "J'en étais sûr C'est toujours ainsi Ça n'arrive qu'à moi". Nous pouvions nous y attendre " dont chacune cache en soi de secrètes précautions conjuguatones (La nuit d'orage, p. 152)

Je le priai de fermer la porte — Bien sûr, dit-il Mais c'est l'autre gourde Il retourna dans le couloir et revint bientôt, poussant devant soi un Delfosse blafard (La pierre d'Horeb, p 259)

L'autre gourde n'est pas Delfosse l'idée du personnage parlant se développe à partir de l'idée qu'il y a plus de *gourdes* qu'un seul [Delfosse] au monde. Le poulu n'a probablement pas attendu la grande guerre pour dire *ça ne va pas mieux* c'est ce que d'après Esnault "répète" le poulu à propos de toute chose de mince importance, qui ne va pas selon son souhait: misère infinie, fatalité inexorable.

Le *se défendre* vosgien au sens de 'se protéger dans le *struggle for life*' a son analogie parfaite dans l'ital. *campare*, mot familier pour *vivere*, avec la nuance indiquée par Petrocchi 'mantenersi in vita, quasi fosse uno scampare, un sottrarsi alla morte': *campare*, comme *scampare* (= **ex-camp-are* 'prendre la clé des champs,' 'décamper' 'se libérer') a voulu dire d'abord 'sauver (en luttant),' cf. l'all *kämpfen* 'combattre,' ainsi *campar la vita* 'sauver sa vie,' le régime pouvant être représenté par le pronom: *camparla* (*come te la campo?* 'comment vis-tu?') et puis disparaître entièrement (sans disparaître d'abord dans l'idée: notre propre vie est un facteur qu'on ne perd pas facilement de vue). Ainsi on dira en italien *si campa!*, réponse à la question 'comment allez-vous?' (= "alla meglio, alla peggio," "si vivacchia," "couci-couci")⁵ et réponse correspondant, par l'*understatement*, à *on se défend*: ce n'est pas une vie rayonnante de bonheur, c'est tout juste si on

⁵ Suivant une observation que je dois à M. Karl Lowith, une réponse italienne typique dans cette même situation est *non c'e male*, avec une nuance plus discrète que la réponse allemande qui correspondrait: *ausgezeichnet!* (il faut penser aussi à l'ital *meno male* au sens 'tant mieux' que j'ai analysé dans mes *Aufsätze*, p 124) La réponse juive à la question *Wie geht's?* — *Man lebt* (généialement prononcé avec un *e* bref, qui semble comme insister sur le prosaïsme de la vie), résultat de beaucoup de désillusions et de la superstition qui veut ne pas exciter l'envie des dieux par l'expression de trop d'optimisme, trahit par la mimique et les gestes l'état de défense permanent et inglorieux d'êtres moins affirmatifs de la vie que les Allemands.

peut glisser le long du précipice toujours prêt à vous avaler. L'homme semble tirer une certaine gloire de sa débrouillardise et de la persécution par une fortune toujours adverse, c'est comme s'il avait besoin de l'idée du malheur pour mettre en relief ses propres talents. L'idée du 'struggle for life' se trouve encore à la base du néogrec *πολεμῶ* 'je fais la guerre' > 'je me donne de la peine, tâche de' (*πολεμῶ νὰ τὸν πείσω* 'je tâche de le persuader'), qui montre le transfert de sens inverse à celui de l'all. *kriegen* 's'efforcer' > 'faire la guerre' (> 'recevoir comme fruit de ses peines').

La courbe de l'évolution de *se défendre* est donc assez curieuse: issu du milieu chevaleresque toujours à l'affût de coups d'un ennemi également vigilant, le mot est descendu dans le milieu des paysans et petits commerçants—ce n'est qu'un hasard si nous n'avons réussi à le trouver que dans les Vosges, et encore seule la plume d'un écrivain comme Taine a pu nous en avertir—et, comme tant d'expressions paysannes (*poilu*, *maousse* etc.), a pénétré dans l'armée, la majorité des membres de laquelle sort de ces milieux. Là, pour un certain temps du moins, il a acquis un sens tout contradictoire à ses origines, celui d'un "vivre agréablement et en même temps dangereusement," d'une jouissance relative de la vie toujours menacée par le sort qui *θεῶν ἐν γούνασι κείται*. Il se peut que *se défendre* soit attiré sémantiquement par son synonyme plus ancien *se débrouiller*,⁶ dont le préfixe *dé-* est celui du latin *discernere* ('séparer d'entre beaucoup de choses la juste') et qui a nombre de descendants sémantiques (*se dém . . . ieller*, *système D* etc.). Le *de-* (cf. lat. *debellari* etc.) serait oublié et le mot moderne serait entré dans le groupe de termes exprimant le *système D*.

Dans un article intéressant, intitulé "'Travail' et 'souffrance,'" qui introduit la sociologie dans les études de linguistique comparative, M. C. Racovița (*Bulletin linguistique* de Bucarest VII, 96) montre que les racines indo-européennes signifiant 'travail':

⁶ Je n'ai lu nulle part la remarque que ce mot, attesté par Dauzat dès la fin du XIX^e s., semble être un apport maritime, d'après les lignes de Loti, *Mon frère Yves* (1885), p. 122.

"C'était le grand ami d'Yves, ce Barrada, qui s'était débrouillé pour repartir une troisième fois sur le même navire que nous . son honneur, à lui, c'était d'être plus beau que les autres, plus lesté et plus fort, plus débrouillard aussi. (Débrouillard et débrouillage sont deux mots qui résument presque à eux seuls toute la marine, ils n'ont pas d'équivalents académiques)"

L'auteur a écrit tous les mots de la famille en italiques

* *uarg-* et * *op-*, loin d'être associées à la souffrance, sont en rapport avec des notions touchant à l'activité religieuse ou au bien-être. Ce sont donc des mots de la langue d'une classe aristocratique, de la classe des maîtres, alors que les expressions particulières, créées plus tard dans chaque langue indo-européenne montrent des mots signifiant à l'origine soit 'torture' (*κράνω*, *travail*, *peiner*, roum. *muncă*) soit 'esclavage' (*Arbeit*, *robot*, néogrec *δουλειά*)—c'est le point de vue de l'opprimé, des populations conquises. Notre *se défendre* est assez curieux: il répond d'abord au roum *a lucra* 'travailler,' litt 'gagner,' mot d'hommes libres (mais plutôt de paysans libres, alors que *se défendre* anc. français reflète un code d'honneur aristocratique); il descend des chevaliers vers les serfs—mais aujourd'hui il remonte et devient, au moins pour un certain laps de temps, le mot d'une *leisure class* "malgré elle."

Le linguiste, habitué aux avatars les plus variés d'un même mot à travers les siècles, est rarement en mesure de cueillir 'sur le fait' un changement de sens en voie de s'accomplir: l'évolution de l'ital. *se la campa bene*, sur laquelle nous ne pouvons que spéculer, a été "vécue" devant nous par *se défendre*.

*The Johns Hopkins University,
Baltimore, Maryland*

LEO SPITZER

¹ Le cliché de pensée préexistant dans les esprits aux expériences individuelles, et l'écart entre le mot et la réalité, sont bien illustrés par la célèbre question du Fabrice de Stendhal sur un champ de bataille "est-ce une vraie bataille?" De même, on refuse à la guerre de position de 1939 le nom "guerre" tout court *drôle de guerre*, traduction de l'expression anglaise *phony war* (elle-même, chez les Anglais sportifs, un "ring-side term" d'origine américaine, cf. Mencken, *The American Language*, p 187), tend à s'implanter en France. M Maurice Schone, dans *Le français moderne* VIII, 1 (Janvier 1940), l'appelle "l'épithète inadmissible". "on ne fait pas d'ironie sur la guerre," écrit-il. Mais l'épithète proposée à la suite de Valéry "cette guerre est singulière" manque de cet humour, grande consolation dans le malheur, qui consiste à faire semblant de supposer normal l'état de choses le plus infortuné et d'accueillir toute accalmie comme un caprice plutôt volontaire du sort. On se procure ainsi la liberté d'apprécier à sa guise ce qui vous arrive (on a ironiquement répété en 1870 le mot de Joséphine de la "petite gué-guerre," en 1914-1918 celui des Allemands "la guerre fraîche et joyeuse," précisément parce que la réalité était toute contraire) *Une drôle de guerre* et *se défendre* sont solidaires dans l'affirmation, par l'homme enveloppé dans ce cataclysme, de son droit à choisir une attitude, un jugement personnel.

URFAUST: WER ERST VON GEISTS ERWEITRUNG
SPRACH!

In the student scene of the *Urfaust* Mephistopheles advises the newly arrived student concerning the physical needs of life at the university. He has spoken about the student's lodgings and is about to speak of his board, when the disappointed young idealist exclaims:

Mich dunkt das gab sich alle nach,
Wer erst von Geists Erweitung sprach!

In *M. L. N.*, vol. LV, March 1940, p. 201 ff. Stuart Atkins discusses this passage and comes to the conclusion that all difficulties are removed if we read 'War' erst von Geistserweiterung Sprach.' But this explanation misses the true meaning of the original as it is based upon certain misconceptions regarding both the idiom and the Gochhausen manuscript.¹

The German idiom is not 'von etwas ist Sprache,' but 'von etwas ist die Sprache.' The definite article is a part of the idiom, just as it is a necessary part of the more common synonymous idiom 'von etwas ist die Rede.' The examples of this idiom given by the author contain the definite article or the negative pronominal adjective *kein*. Cf. Fischer, *Schwabisches Wörterbuch* V col. 1571. Ja du! von dir ist die Sprache. Müller-Fraureuth, *Wörterbuch der obersächsischen und erzgebirgischen Mundarten* II 543: es ist die Sprache von etwas. This fact alone vitiates the explanation given above.

To justify the substitution of *War*' for *Wer* of the text the author states: "Fraulein von Gochhausen frequently substituted *e* for *a*, especially when the latter recurred in successive lines." But a careful examination of the orthography of Erich Schmidt's edition will reveal that nowhere is *e* substituted for *a* except in the case of *hett*' for *hatt*' which is found four times on p. 21 in the refrain: *Als hett sie* (or *es*) *Lieb im Leibe*. The refrain is repeated on p. 22. The form *hatt* as archaic past indicative is found three times on p. 21, ls. 28, 30, 39 and on p. 25, ls. 112, 113, 115; *hett* as indicative is also found p. 24, ls. 97, 101; p. 39, l. 612; *hatt* as past subjunctive we find p. 33, l. 494, p. 41, l. 667, p. 43 l. 726,

¹ Cf. Erich Schmidt, *Goethes Faust in ursprünglicher Gestalt*,⁵ Weimar 1901, p. 13, ls. 307/8. Max Morris, *Der junge Goethe*, Leipzig, 1907, v, 372.

p. 48, l. 808. *Hette* as form of the past indicative and subjunctive was very common in the older orthography, especially in the sixteenth century; it is the only spelling used by Hans Sachs (cf. *DWb* s. v. haben 5). Since the seventeenth century the prevailing form was *hatte*, but *hette* continued in use for a long time, especially among South German writers. As there are no other words in the Gochhausen manuscript that show the substitution of *e* for *a*, the appearance of the archaic form *hette* by the side of modern *hatte* cannot be used as an argument for the assumption that 'wer' stands for 'ware,' even though in Goethe's letters of the Leipzig period we find occasionally such a substitution, e. g. *Ermel*, *Merz*.²

Equally questionable is the statement that Fraulein von Gochhausen "sometimes used a small *s* instead of the capital, as in l. 50 of the manuscript." This is to support the assumption that *sprach* in our line is in reality the noun *Sprache* and not the past tense of *sprechen*. In Goethe's Leipzig letters we find at times nouns written with small initials (cf. Loiseau, *loc. cit.* p. 5), but I can find no example of that in the Gochhausen text. In Max Morris' edition (*Der junge Goethe* V 362) we find l. 50 the reading *staubbedeckt*, Erich Schmidt has *Staub bedeckt*. The difference in reading is due to lack of clearness in the manuscript. Morris (*loc. cit.* VI 531) has this note: "staubbedeckt ist in der Hs. undeutlich korrigiert: st aus St. oder umgekehrt. Die Konstruktion spricht für die gewählte Lesung." In other words the manuscript does not make it clear whether a capital *S* is intended or a small *s*. Morris reads a small *s*, his *staubbedeckt* is a compound adjectival past participle modifying *Bucherhauff* in the preceding line, Erich Schmidt sees a capital *S* and prints *Staub bedeckt*. *Staub* is the noun, the subject of the relative clause referring to *Bucherhauff*. There is here no case of a noun spelled with a small initial.

Apparent cases of nouns spelled with small initials are *Ganse stuhlgang* (Erich Schmidt ed. p. 13, l. 315) and *Kerzen stumpfgen* (p. 27, l. 154), Morris writes *Gansestuhlgang* and *Kerzenstumpfgen*. A similar case is *all Erden weh* (p. 5, l. 112) found in both

² Cf. H. Loiseau, *La Langue du Jeune Goethe*, Paris, 1911, p. 16 *Knäten* p. 34, l. 503, is a variant spelling of *kneten* with a long tradition behind it, cf. *DWb* s. v. *kneten* 1 f. *Blücken* p. 81, l. 35 is an unusual and archaic form of *blecken* or *blocken*. *Fraulein* p. 45, l. 760 compared with *Fräulein* p. 49, l. 835, p. 31, l. 457, p. 32, l. 459 stands by itself. We have here the diphthong

editions. We have here compounds which according to the usage of the eighteenth century and of to-day capitalize only the first component. According to Erich Schmidt (*loc. cit.* p. lxxvi) it is characteristic of young Goethe's orthography to separate the parts of a compound. There are indeed irregularities in the use of capitals in the Gochhausen manuscript. Adjectives used as nouns are frequently written with small initials, but the spelling of such adjectival nouns was not regulated for a long time. Cf. p. 1, l. 18 *was rechts*, p. 12, l. 270 *das gute*, l. 271 *das böse* etc. The infinitive used as a noun is not capitalized p. 79, l. 1412 *das durch erschüttern durcherwarmen*. Adjectives and adverbs are at times capitalized, cf. p. 34, l. 504 *manche Welsch Geschicht*, p. 4, l. 98, p. 29, l. 185, the adverb *Mutterlich* p. 36 l. 556, also p. 66, l. 1142, but there is no case parallel to *sprach* standing for the noun *die Sprach*.

The explanation of the lines offered in the edition of *Goethe's Urfaust* by L. H. F. Lenz and F. J. Nock (Harper & Brothers, 1938, p. 19) "kame alles nach und nach von selbst für den, der . . ." and in the Danish edition:³ "Wer = demjenigen, der: vilde altsammen bagefter give sig for den, som først talte om Aandsutvikling" does not quite express the meaning of the original. It is clear that the student expects and wants Mephistopheles to talk about expansion of the spirit. That is the student's real interest. The physical needs will take care of themselves, they are no problem to the student, he knows how to manage that part of his life at the university but the professor is to show him the way to spiritual expansion. The physical needs are those of the student, not of Mephistopheles. It is therefore misleading to say: For him who speaks of the expansion of the spirit (this can only refer to Mephistopheles), all that will take care of itself, i. e. for him all the physical problems will take care of themselves. This translation would refer the physical needs to Mephistopheles.

To get the true meaning of this passage we must remember that we have here an archaic sentence structure which goes back to Middle High German and even to Old High German. The *Knittelvers* in the eighteenth century is generally characterized by archaisms in phraseology, sentence structure and rhyme. That is true of much of the *Knittelvers* written by young Goethe. In Middle High

³ As this Danish edition is not accessible to me, I quote from Mr. Atkins' article.

German we find the indefinite relative pronoun *swer* introducing a conditional clause. This *swer* corresponds in Modern German to the conditional particle *wenn* followed by *einer* or *jemand*. Instead of *swer* we frequently find the relative pronoun *der* introducing a conditional clause. This MHG *der* must also be rendered by *wenn jemand* or *einer*. In New High German *wer* takes the place of the MHG conditional *der*. This type of conditional sentence is discussed in Paul-Gierach, *Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik* (Halle 1929) 347 and in Behaghel's *Deutsche Syntax*, vol. III p. 773 f.: *swer mir anders tuot, daz ist mir leit, wenn mich jemand anders behandelt, so tut mir das leid* (Walther); *der uns zwei versuonde vil wol, des waer ich gemeit, wenn jemand uns zwei gar wohl versohnen wurde, so würde ich darüber glücklich sein* (Der von Kurenberg). We find the construction in Luther's Bible, 2. Maccabees 2, 28 *gleich wie es on erbeit nicht zugehet, der eine Malzeit zurichten und den Gesten gutlich thun will*. The verse was later modernized and we read now: *gleichwie es ohne Arbeit nicht zugehet, wenn man eine Mahlzeit zurichten . . . will*. Luke 6, 30 *wer dir das Deine nimmt, da fordere es nicht wieder, i. e. wenn jemand dir das Deine nimmt*. The construction is not unknown in modern German as may be seen from the examples given in F. Blatz' *Neuhochdeutsche Grammatik* II, 869, Anm. 11 (Karlsruhe 1896) · *Rein und erquickend stromt Wahrheit, wer sie vom Quell schöpft, (Herder), i. e. wenn man sie vom Quell schöpft; Freiheit' ein schönes Wort, wei's recht verstünde (Goethe's Egmont), i. e. wenn man es recht verstunde. Es ist schlimm, wer mit den Gerichten zu tun hat, i. e. wenn man mit den Gerichten zu tun hat*.

We may paraphrase our two lines as follows: *Mich dünkt, das wurde sich nachher alles von selbst ergeben, wenn man nur erst von Geisteserweiterung sprechen wurde*.

The indefinite pronoun *man* may be used instead of a personal pronoun if for any reason the speaker wishes to avoid the direct reference implied in the personal pronoun. Cf. *DWb* s. v. *man* 5 and 6. *Einer* may sometimes be used instead of *man*. That is especially characteristic of the second person. "Wer ist man?" or "was will man hier?" in modern German is a rather brusque and impolite way of asking: "wer bist du?" or "wer sind Sie?" But this *man* or *einer* may also be used when the speaker is conscious of his own humbleness compared with the person he is

addressing and slightly criticizing, as is the case with the student speaking to and criticizing the famous professor.

Wer in our passage stands for *wenn emer* or *wenn man*, and this in turn stands for *wenn du* or *wenn Ihr*. We therefore translate the two lines: It seems to me all this would later take care of itself if you would only first speak of spiritual expansion. *sprach* rhyming with *nach* stands for the past subjunctive *sprache*, a bold deviation from grammatical norm, but we are dealing with *Knüttelvers* where violations of language and grammar especially in the rhyme may be expected. In fact one of the objections that Opitz and his followers had against the use of the *Knüttelvers* in German was its frequent violation of accepted linguistic forms.

W. H. Van Der Smitten in his translation of the *Urfaust* (*Goethe's Faust*. London and Toronto 1926, p. 387, l. 309) has rendered the idiom in our passage correctly when he says: "That ought to come of its own accord./Would you but speak of spiritual food!" But he needlessly deviates from the original by changing the comma at the end of the first line to a period making a wish clause or a hortatory clause of the second line instead of a conditional clause.

JOHN A. WALZ

Harvard University

THE DUAL TIME-SCHEME IN CHAUCER'S *TROILUS*

The general impression and effect of *Troilus and Criseyde* is one of continuous action over one season between spring and winter, and Chaucer conceived it so. There are in the poem two concentric and contradictory time-schemes; one of them is based upon the formal dating of the books, the other upon a proportionately spaced series of seasonal images. The second of these time-schemes is the one with which this paper is concerned. A skeletal series of seasonal images is used to produce an artistic illusion of unity without disturbing the actual history of events. Of course, not all of the images in the poem contribute to this sequence, but none of them disturbs it; those which are not part of the structure are irrelevant. I shall trace the sequence of these structural images, maintaining at the same time its relationship to the formal time-scheme of the poem and to the *Filostrato*.

The time consumed in the story of Troilus and Criseyde is about three years (5. 8-14),¹ but within this limit the action falls into two sequences of short duration. The first sequence is that which begins with Troilus' first sight of Criseyde in the temple and ends with the consummation of their love. Roughly, this sequence occupies two months. The first book begins in April (1 158-61), and the second begins in May (2 50-56). The main part of the action in the third book—that is, the third book up to and including the meeting in Pandarus' house—continues in May, as the conjunction of Saturn and Jove in Cancer, which occurred in May, proves.²

By a passage to which I have already referred (5. 8-14) we know that about three years elapse between the meeting at Pandarus' house and the beginning of the fourth book. There is no way, however, to tell exactly how long the action of the last two books is, for Chaucer refuses to say.³ The nature and sequence of events indicate that it was a matter of a few months. Actually the poem occupies two months at the first and about six months at the last of its total time of duration, which is at least three years, there is a gap of about three years in the middle of the poem.

Boccaccio does no more than to tell us at the beginning of his poem that it is spring, and at the end, that it is again spring. Chaucer's formal dating does not come from his immediate sources. Wherever Chaucer got his formal time-scheme, it is apparent that he regards it as essential. The dating of the fifth book (5. 8 ff.), with its introduction of a three year break in the middle of the poem, is the most important of his innovations. Perhaps it may be accounted for as an attempt to ameliorate Criseyde's crime. It is more likely that Chaucer had some unaccountable impression that in adapting this stanza (cf. *Teseide* II, 1; and *Thebaid* IV, 1-2)

¹ R. K. Root, ed. *Troilus and Criseyde*, Princeton, 1926, pp. xxxi-xxxiv.

² An objection may be raised to this hypothesis on the ground of Pandarus' speech (2. 1298), but in this passage "yeres two" is no more than a good round number to give point to a generalization (T. A. Kirby, "A Note on Troilus," *MLR*, xxxix (1934), 67-8). It is also worth noting that Troilus refers (3. 360-62) to "Aperil the laste," for this places the third book within the first year of the story (R. K. Root, *op cit*, p. xxxin).

³ R. K. Root, *op cit*, pp. 549-50. It is true, as Chaucer says, that his authors do not tell him in so many words how long it was, but by careful attention to the time-indications in the book of Benoit, "one finds that between the arrival of Briseida at the Grecian camp and her final acceptance of Diomedes there is an interval of at least twenty-one months"

he was more nearly retaining the truth of the Troy story. Perhaps Mr. Root's suggestion ⁴ that by this device of formal dating Chaucer "contributes to this sense of the actual," which is the most remarkable characteristic of the poem, is the correct one. Wherever Chaucer got his formal time-scheme, and for whatever reason he included it, he seems to have regarded it as a thing more or less beyond his direct control, and to preserve in his poem the unity of a single action, a unity which Boccaccio left undisturbed by formal datings, Chaucer devised a second, concentric time-scheme based upon a sequence of images

It is important to bear in mind that the two time-schemes do not start from the same point. The first book is dated in April (1. 155-61) by a stanza corresponding in position with Boccaccio's general statement that his story begins in spring time (*Fil.* 1. 18). The dating is in strict accord with convention, and the "swote smellen floures" are standard properties. The second book is dated in the same fashion (2. 50-56), but there is no corresponding dating in Boccaccio ⁵. The formal time-scheme begins, then, "with newe grene, of lusty Veer the pryme." On the other hand, the second scheme begins earlier in the season, lags behind the formal dating, and keeps pace with the emotional climate of the story. In the consideration of the artistic time-scheme we may identify the images which concern us as those which are applied in simile to the characters.

The first image of importance to our structure is spoken by

⁴*Ibid.*, p. xxxiii

⁵C. S. Lewis ("What Chaucer Really Did to *Il Filostrato*," *Essays and Studies*, xvii (1932), 61) intimates that Chaucer inserted it in observance of the decorum of the medieval court of love and of the medieval rhetoricians. There is a comparable line in Boccaccio's *Teseide* (II, 21 ff.), but Chaucer did not specifically adopt it in the *Knight's Tale*, instead he expanded the idea of the potency of the month of May over lovers (*KT*, 1042-47, 1500). H. M. Cummings (*The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Works to the Italian Works of Boccaccio*, Menasha, Wisconsin, 1916, p. 134) notices this expansion as one of Chaucer's significant additions to his source. The dating of poems of courtly love in the spring was a widely observed convention, as Rosemond Tuve (*Seasons and Months, Studies in a Tradition of Middle English Poetry*, Paris, 1933; and "Spring in Chaucer and before Him," *MLN*, LII (1937), 9-16) has shown. To the same effect is an interesting suggestion of Roland Smith ("Three Notes on the Knight's Tale," *MLN*, LI (1936), 319-20)

Troilus when in the privacy of his room he complains that love afflicts him.

But also cold in love towards the
 Thi lady is, as frost in wynter moone,
 And thow fordon, as snow in fire is soone (1 523-25)

This figure is taken from a corresponding place in the *Filostrato* (1. 53), but Chaucer's taking it is less significant than his not taking another figure which Boccaccio used only three stanzas later. Boccaccio's figure is this. "If thou, lady, doest this, I shall revive as a flower in the fresh meadow in spring time." (*Fil.* 1. 56) Chaucer's general tendency is to temper the conceitism of Boccaccio's characters,⁶ but in this instance he had an explicit reason for rejecting Boccaccio's figure. Obviously, it is a spring-time figure, and the characters, despite their April setting, are not yet in harmony with it.

This divergence of seasons, ever narrowing, is maintained into the second book, undisturbed by the conventional dating on "Mayes day the Thrydde" The background is constantly that of flowers, meads, and the season of love, but the climate of the story itself is not so. Gradually the imagery of the story converges toward that of the setting; the limit can only be, of course, at the climax of the plot. When Criseyde is first shaken by Pandarus' shrewd arguments for love, this is the simile applied to her:

But right as when the sonne shyneth brighte
 In March, that chaungeth ofte tyme his face,
 And that a cloude is put with wynd to flighte,
 Which oversprat the sonne as for a space,
 A cloudy thought gan thorough hire soule pace,
 (2. 764-68) ⁷

The events which follow are toward a happy consummation of the love affair, and when Pandare returns to Troilus with good news, Chaucer uses a simile which shows clearly the progress of this second, subliminal spring. It is translated from a corresponding passage in Boccaccio's version (*Fil.* 2. 80).

But right as floures, thorough the cold of nyght
 Iclosed, stoupen on hire stalke lowe,

⁶ Cf. *Fil.* 52, *T. and C.* 5 1317 ff

⁷ This image has no parallel in Boccaccio, though the passage of which it is a part is an almost literal translation of *Fil.* II, 69, 75-77. The image itself is taken from *Boece* 1, m. 3, 7-10.

Redressen hem ayein the sonne bright,
 And spreden on hire kynde cours by rowe,
 Right so gan tho his eighen up to throwe
 This Troilus .

(2 967-72) ⁸

Book three is comparatively barren of developed images, but the one notable image which occurs is emphasized by the weakening at this point of the formal time-scheme.⁹ This image is taken with some changes from Boccaccio (*Fl.* 3. 12), but it is expanded with the evident desire to make it the "pryme" of the illusory year.

But right so as thise holtes and thise hayis,
 That han in wynter dede ben and dreye,
 Revesten hem in grene, when that May is,
 Whan every lusty liketh best to pleye,
 Right in that selve wise, soth to seye,
 Wax sodeynliche his heite ful of joie,
 That gladder was ther nevere man in Troie

(3 351-57)

The sequence of imagery from the beginning of the poem through the third book is in effect the story of the coming of a spring, that it is deliberately so we may judge from the facts that it accords with the development of the plot, and that images in the Italian source are apparently adopted or rejected with this structure in mind.

The beginning of the fourth book is, of course, the beginning of the tragic conclusion of the story; it is also the point of reversal in the year of images.¹⁰ This point is indicated by what is perhaps one of the most striking departures from the source in the entire poem; there is no question but that some definite critical idea led Chaucer to it. Boccaccio describes Troilus at the moment when Troilus hears that Cressida is to be exchanged for Antenor:

Ev'n as the lily, after it hath been turned up in the fields by the plough,
 droopeth and withereth from too much sun and its bright color changeth

⁸ Cf. Dante, *Inferno*, II, 127-29

⁹ *V ante*, p. 2 n. 2

¹⁰ The formal dating of Book IV is not determinate (*v. R. K. Root, op. cit.*, p. 500, note on IV, 21-32). The continuity of the dating in July is immediately broken by lines 36-37. In effect, Chaucer says: "I don't know how much time elapsed between July 12 and the beginning of this book." He goes on at once to action which occurs at an unknown distance of time after July 12.

and groweth pale, so at the message brought to the Greeks . . . did Troilus . . . (Fil 4 18) ¹¹

If Chaucer had adopted this image, it would have seemed a logical development from an earlier one in his poem (2.967-72), but he did not adopt it. He wanted an image which conveyed not only the pathetic aspect of Troilus' misfortune, but also the idea of autumn. The images portray the coming and passing of a summer. The simile which Chaucer used to replace Boccaccio's is this:

And as in wynter leves ben braft,
Ech after other, til the tree be bare,
So that ther nys but bark and braunche ilaft,
Lith Troilus . . . (4. 225-28) ¹²

This image, like the one in the third book, carries the weight of the story; we are not told until book five that three years have elapsed since Troilus first saw Criseyde. Thus the imaginary time-scheme is reinforced at the very point where the formal time-scheme collapses; and a hiatus of three years does not disturb the unity of the poem.

The fifth book continues the poetic year by more subtle devices than those that have preceded, for the general effect has been established. In the second stanza we learn the Phebus has melted the snows three times since the story began. Single lines now achieve the end to which five-line similes were devoted earlier. When Troilus makes his pathetic visit to Criseyde's empty house, "As frost, hym thoughte, his herte gan to colde." (5.535) This line does not come from Boccaccio. Not only does Chaucer invent this line for the purpose, but also he omits, with the passage in which Deiphoebus discovers Troilus' love for Cressida, a simile of coming spring and greening meadows (*Fil.* 5.78).

¹¹ Qual, poseia ch' e dall' aratro intaccato
Nè campi il giglio, per soverchio sole
Casca ed appassa, e'l bel color cangiato
Pallido fassi, tale, alle parole
Rendute a' Greci dal determinato
Consiglio infra' Troian, in tanta mole
Di danno e periglio, tramortito
Lì cadde Troilo d'alto duol ferito.

(All references to *Il Filostrato* in this paper are to the edition and translation of N. E. Griffin and A. B. Myrick, Philadelphia, 1929.)

¹² Cf. Dante, *Inferno*, III, 112-18.

The song of Troilus to the horned moon is part of a special phase which the imagery of the waning year takes in the last book; Chaucer makes use of darkness to obtain the effect he desires. In the long scene of Troilus' waiting at the gate for Criseyde's return, Boccaccio employs a brief description of the closing of the city for the night (*Fl.* 7. 11). Chaucer adopts it:

The warden of the yates gan to calle
The folk which that withoute the yates were,
And had hem dryven in hire bestes alle,
Oȝ al the nyght they moste bleven there (5 1177-80)

The sombre coloring of the last book is in contrast to the bright season of the middle of the poem.¹³

There are, then, two complete and concentric time-schemes in *Troilus and Criseyde*: the one is the actual, basic time-scheme of three years; the other is the practical, artistic scheme of one year, or the coming and departure of one summer. The advantage of such a plan is obvious; it combines truth to conventional sequence with artistic unity. The fact that it is self-contradictory bothers no one. The thing to be desired is a general effect of artistic unity, and that this poem has that effect is beyond question.

The Citadel, Charleston

HENRY W. SAMS

VOLTAIRE'S *BRUTUS* DURING THE FRENCH REVOLUTION *

In the preface to *Brutus* in his edition of Voltaire's works, Moland summarizes a common assumption about the popularity of the tragedy during the Revolution when he says: "Il est constant que *Brutus* fut une des pièces qui eurent le plus de succès pendant la Révolution."¹ Yet when one examines in detail the reaction of the public towards the play from 1789 to 1794, both in Paris and in the provinces, one reaches the conclusion that such a sweeping statement must needs be qualified.

¹³ A S Cook ("Chaucer Troilus and Criseyde," *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, 119 (1907), pp 40-54) notices that Boccaccio, in accord with Dante and the ancients, identifies love with light and the sun

* With the support of a grant from the American Philosophical Society

¹ *Œuvres complètes de Voltaire* (Paris, 1877), II, 306.

The early history of *Brutus* is well known: it was one of the less successful of Voltaire's works,² having had only 15 performances in the 1730-31 season and an equal number at scattered revivals during the next sixty years, it was one of those plays more frequently read than performed. *Brutus* had to wait for the coming of the Revolution to have the clamorous, though sporadic, success of a "pièce de combat."

From the early months of 1790, the "comédiens" had been entreated to revive *Brutus* but they had objected, remembering perhaps how the revolutionists had exploited *Charles IX* the previous year and fearing the effect of another controversial subject on an already inflamed public mind. The actors had to yield finally, and a "reprise" was announced for November 17, 1790. The performance was tumultuous.³ Partisans of all groups turned out en masse, but the "municipalité" expected trouble and spectators were not allowed to enter with weapons.⁴ Before the play began, Mirabeau was noticed in a "loge du centre" and was summoned by popular demand "à la place la plus honorable."⁵ When the curtain rose, cheering broke out and was maintained so continuously by the adherents of one party or another that the actors had difficulty in reading their lines. While royalists applauded the conspiracy between Arons and Messala, revolutionists tried to have the more liberal maxims repeated, but the common sense of the majority did not permit either extreme to predominate. The spectators, interpreting the play in the light of current events, no longer thought of Rome, of senators, of the king, of Tarquin, rather, they understood Paris, the deputies of the Constituent Assembly and the Bourbon monarchy.⁶ Although the audience cheered at the humilia-

² Voltaire permitted it to be said in the "avertissement" of the 1738 edition of his works "C'est de toutes les pièces de l'auteur celle qui eut en France le moins de succès aux représentations" (Moland, *op cit*, II, 309).

³ Complete accounts of the evening may be found in *La Chronique de Paris* (18 novembre 1790), *Le Moniteur Universel* (19 novembre 1790), *La Gazette Universelle* (22 novembre 1790), *Le Journal de Leyde* (26 novembre 1790), etc.

⁴ For the second and succeeding performances the announcement in *Le Moniteur Universel* carried the following statement "Conformément aux ordres de la municipalité, le public est prévenu que l'on entrera sans cannes, bâtons, épées et sans aucune espèce d'armes offensives"

⁵ *La Nouvelliste de France*, 19 novembre 1790

⁶ The mania during the Revolution to interpret classic plays according

tion of Arons and his accomplices, there was no sign of an unfavorable allusion to the king of France. In fact, when Brutus declaimed

. je te verrai vaincre, ou mourirai comme toi,
Vengeur du nom romain, libre encore, et sans roi, (iv, 6)

the spectators shouted "Vive le roi!", and then they added, "Vive la nation!" and "Vive la liberté!", as if to distribute their praise equally. The precepts of liberty expressed by Brutus, pure intellectual concepts for the society of 1730, took on a moving significance for the audiences of 1790. Revolutionists acclaimed the vigorous patriotism of Brutus, the indignation of the senators, the federative oath on the altar of Mars; and at the moment when Brutus cried:

Dieux! donnez-nous la mort plutôt que l'esclavage! (iv, 7)

there was pandemonium.

The second performance a few days later was scarcely more tranquil than the first. At the final curtain, the actors added a tableau, composed by David, which showed Brutus looking at the body of his dead son. This scene sent the spectators into raptures of patriotic exultation and it was included in performances thereafter.

It is to be noted that at this point in the Revolution *Brutus* was played only at the Comédie Française and its popularity was limited, so to speak, to the élite groups which frequented that theater. In mid-December 1790, Laharpe utilized the Brutus incident in his plea before the Constituent Assembly for laws which would free the theater from its traditional shackles and give more freedom to the new playhouses along the boulevard.⁷ He exploited the recent bickerings between the deputies and the "comédiens," ridiculing the actors for resisting popular demands and arguing that such a situation could never have arisen if all dramatic works were not abandoned by ancient privilege to the discretion of one troupe. He called the performances of *Brutus* a triumph of public opinion

to current circumstances started with the revival of Destouches's *L'ambitieux et l'indiscret* which had failed in 1737. Chosen by Mlle Contat and Molé as a vehicle to display their talents, the play had an unexpected success in 1789 because the public saw Louis XVI and Necker in the rôles of the Spanish monarch and Don Philippe. Cf. H. Lumière, *Le théâtre-français pendant la révolution* (Paris, 1894), pp. 24-25.

⁷ For the complete text, see *Le Journal des Amis de la Constitution*, No. 4 (21 décembre 1790).

and he stressed the point that the audiences did not apply the tirades against kings to Louis XVI. Laharpe made his mark—the Constituent Assembly passed a series of decrees anent the theater which, among other things, abolished the privileges of the “comédiens du roi” and transferred the classic repertory to the public domain for other troupes to use (13-19 janvier 1791).

It was several months later—May 25, 1791—that the Théâtre de la Nation⁸ announced a performance of *Brutus* for “lundi.” The next day the Théâtre de la rue de Richelieu, founded by Talma and the left-wing group which had just broken away from the loyal artists of the Comédie, also advertised a “première” of *Brutus* for “lundi prochain” “Lundi” would be May 30, the anniversary of Voltaire’s death and sufficient reason for offering one of his plays. But that both houses should choose the same play emphasizes the rivalry between them. Curiously enough, only one critic spoke of this dual performance, which must have been fraught with undercurrents, both personal and patriotic, yet almost every paper carried a review of *La bienfaisance de Voltaire*, the afterpiece given on the occasion at the Théâtre de la Nation. Of course, it would have been unnecessary to comment on the *Brutus* production at the Théâtre de la Nation, for all newspapers had reviewed it six months previously, but to ignore a major production of a Voltaire tragedy with Talma and Monvel in leading rôles must have indicated apathy on the part of the public.

Moland speaks of “la reprise très-remarquable de *Brutus* . . . au théâtre de la rue de Richelieu, où Monvel et Talma réunirent tous les suffrages dans les rôles de Brutus et de Titus.”⁹ That statement seems to be more conjecture than fact, since contemporary evidence does not show what people thought of the revival. The piece was handsomely staged and Moland must have believed that a play like *Brutus* with Talma and Monvel would have been very remarkable. The most eloquent condemnation of it, however, is the fact that Talma withdrew his production after the third performance and postponed consecutive acting of the tragedy until the Terror.

As the tempo of the Revolution slackened during the Legislative Assembly (October 1, 1791—September 20, 1792), there were only

⁸ The Théâtre Français adopted the name, Théâtre de la Nation, early in the Revolution as a patriotic gesture

⁹ *Op cit*, II, 306

four performances of *Brutus*, which indicates that curiosity in the play had dwindled. When the monarchy fell, however, the radical elements in control of the National Convention used the theater to spread propaganda and direct public opinion by forcing more frequent presentations of "pièces patriotiques." *Brutus*, by virtue of its liberal maxims and anti-monarchical tirades, was considered by republican zealots to be one of the most desirable patriotic plays. The constant pressure on impresarios to give *Brutus*, the repeated mention of it in decrees governing the theater, the paeans of praise bestowed upon it by certain prominent leaders, have given rise to the theory that it was one of the most performed plays of the Terror. Actually, quite the contrary is true.

In the summer of 1793, when the Reign of Terror was gathering momentum, a few of the thirty playhouses in Paris offered free performances of *Brutus*, "par et pour le peuple," but they were not repeated. The deputy, Delacroix, evidently inspired by wishful thinking, exalted the salutary effects of *Brutus* on the public mind and urged that the "comité de salut public prenne des mesures qu'on ne joue que des pièces républicaines."¹⁰ The Committee adopted Delacroix' suggestion to the extent that theaters had to give patriotic plays three times a week. As the performances did not prove to be financially successful, the Committee allotted 100,000 francs to support them.

Even government subsidy and Jacobin coercion did not tend to popularize *Brutus*. The explanation is simple enough: the troupes at the new theaters, created by revolutionary freedom to spread revolutionary doctrines, were incapable of playing tragedy, and the public which supported those theaters had no taste for literary masterpieces. Paradoxically, the suppression of the Théâtre de la Nation, perpetrated by Collot-d'Herbois to settle old scores against the former "comédiens du roi," eliminated the best production of *Brutus* from the Parisian scene. During the last ten months of the Terror *Brutus* was played only twelve times at Talma's theater, which had by this time become the official stage of the government, and eight times at the unimportant Théâtre des Sans-Culottes. Perhaps, as Laharpe says,¹¹ *Brutus* was too mild for rabid republicans by

¹⁰ *Le Moniteur Universel*, 15 août 1793.

¹¹ *Cours de littérature* (Paris, an VII), IX, 140; cf also Villemain, *Œuvres* (Paris, 1868), III, 192, and d'Estrée, *Le théâtre sous la terreur* (Paris, 1913), p 10.

1794. In any event, this tragedy never had the qualities to appeal to the masses. When compared to the overwhelming popularity of such plays as *Nicodème dans la lune* and *Les visitandines*, *Brutus* made a dismal showing indeed during the Revolution.

The exploitation of *Brutus* in the provinces, chiefly at the hands of "représentants en mission," met with indifference, even resistance. At Lyon,¹² *Brutus* was advertised. As the curtain was about to go up, a spectator leaped to the stage and urged the audience not to listen to a play which preached hatred of the throne. The audience shouted "Point de *Brutus*" and the actors gave *Richard, Cœur-de-Lyon* instead. At Angers, a troupe offered a performance of *Brutus*. "Les patriotes s'y sont rendus, comptant y être fort pressés, et ont trouvé la salle presque déserte."¹³ *Brutus* was played at Lille during the 1793-94 season, but "les citoyens fréquentaient peu le théâtre, trop sujet aux caprices des républicains outrés."¹⁴ The sanguinary "représentant en mission" to Cambrai, Joseph Lebon, brought in a troupe to produce republican plays. If *Brutus* played to full houses, it may be assumed that Lebon's insane patriotism did not tolerate empty houses.¹⁵ I have found no evidence of a thoroughly successful performance of *Brutus* in the provinces that sprang from a spontaneous desire on the part of the people.

An analysis of these facts forces one to the conclusion that *Brutus* was scarcely more popular during the Revolution than it ever had been, but that it was constantly associated with circumstances and propaganda which kept it before the public eye and gave it the appearance of success. It had a momentary flare of popularity among the intellectuals at the brilliant revival in 1790, but thereafter it was given only sporadic performances of questionable quality.

After the fall of Robespierre, when the first reaction was to suppress plays which glorified a too rigorous republicanism, *Brutus* was discarded from active repertories. Occasional performances of the tragedy took place until the establishment of the Consulat; then it disappeared from the Parisian stages. Although *Brutus* was given once before the imperial court, Napoleon never permitted it to be

¹² *La Feuille du Jour*, 9 décembre 1790

¹³ Queruau-Lamerie, *Notice sur le théâtre d'Angers*, p. 84

¹⁴ Lefebvre, *Histoire du théâtre de Lille*, II, 109-121

¹⁵ Durieux, *Le théâtre à Cambrai avant et depuis 1789*, p. 95.

performed in public as long as he was in power.¹⁶ To my knowledge, *Brutus* has not been revived at the Comédie Française since the revolutionary period.

KENNETH N. MCKEE

New York University

AN UNPUBLISHED LETTER OF FÉNELON

François de Salignac de la Mothe-Fénelon (1651-1715), Archbishop of Cambrai, in the last years of his life, devoted himself principally to combating Jansenism in all its doctrinal and political aspects. His *Mémoires*, *Mandements*, *Ordonnances*, *Instructions Pastorales*¹ and private correspondence² against Jansenism, the Jansenist party and those prejudiced in its favor prove that the heresy and its *cabale* had no more zealous, persistent or able foe.

In this struggle which aligned the King, Jesuits and Ultramon-
tanes against the Gallicans and Jansenists³ Fénelon was opposed chiefly by Louis-Antoine de Noailles (1651-1729), Archbishop of Paris. Actually more Gallican than Jansenistic in his sympathies, Noailles,⁴ nevertheless, identified himself with some of the party's most ardent advocates and followed a policy of vacillation and contradiction which confused the defenders of the Church's infallibility and encouraged resistance among the dissidents. His imprudent approbation of a new edition of Quesnel's Jansenist work, *Réflexions morales sur les livres du nouveau Testament*, in 1695⁵ and his

¹⁶ Muret, *L'Histoire par le théâtre* (Paris, 1865), pp 342-345; also Hallays-Dabot, *L'histoire de la censure théâtrale en France* (Paris, 1862), p 226

¹ Fénelon, *Œuvres complètes*, Paris, Leroux et Jouby, 1848-1852. Section III *Ouvrages sur le Jansénisme* Vols. III-V

² *Ibid*, Vols VII-VIII

³ N Abercrombie, *The Origins of Jansenism*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1936 Cf pp 305-313.

⁴ P B Gams, *Series Episcoporum Ecclesiae Catholicae*, Leipzig, Hiersemann, 1931 Noailles was named Bishop of Cahors in 1679, transferred to Châlons-sur-Marne in 1680, made Archbishop of Paris in 1695 and appointed Cardinal in 1700 Cf pp 525, 535, 597.

⁵ *Le Nouveau Testament en français avec des Réflexions morales sur chaque verset pour en rendre la lecture plus utile et la méditation plus aisée* Paris, Pralard, 1693

opposition to the punitive measures invoked against Quesnel and the Party from 1703 to 1728, when he himself finally accepted the Bull *Unigenitus*,⁶ were largely responsible for the revival and continuation of hostilities between the rival factions.

Fénelon's efforts to extirpate Jansenism, however, were severely handicapped by royal disfavor and his exile in Cambrai. Nevertheless, the presence and position at Court of the Archbishop's two principal allies, the Duke of Chevreuse (1646-1712) and Father Michel Le Tellier (1643-1719), Jesuit confessor of the King, enabled him indirectly to keep Louis XIV informed of new developments and to spur him on to action against the threatening dangers to Church and State. Using the Duke of Chevreuse as his intermediary, Fénelon carried on an open⁷ and a secret correspondence⁸ with Le Tellier, and, in addition, wrote instructions and advice to the Duke of Chevreuse to be conveyed verbally by him to the confessor.⁹ Le Tellier transmitted to Louis XIV those suggestions of Fénelon which he deemed necessary and appropriate and relayed the answers to Fénelon through the Duke of Chevreuse or through the regular channels according to their nature. The majority of these letters exchanged between Fénelon and the Duke of Chevreuse¹⁰ and those between Fénelon and Le Tellier,¹¹ dating from 1703 to 1715, record the inconsistent attitude and conduct of Cardinal de Noailles in several developments of the history of Jansenism. They also reveal Fénelon's ceaseless and determined efforts, public and secret, to counteract the obstructionist policy of his hierarchical superior.

The manuscript letter¹² published here for the first time is un-

⁶ Cf Vacant, Mangenot et Amann, *Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique*, Paris, Letouzey et Ané, 1924 Art Noailles, II, 678-679

⁷ E g, Fénelon, *op. cit.*, VII, 339

⁸ E g, *ibid.*, VII, 690.

⁹ E g, *ibid.*, VII, 338.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, Vol VII Letters No LIX, CVIII, CIX, CXIII, CXXIV, CXXV, CXXX, CXXXI, CXLII, CXLIV, CXLVII, CXLVIII, CLII, CLIV, CLV, CLXV, CLXVIII, CLXIX, CLXXIV, CLXXXI, CLXXXII, CLXXXIV, CCCLXX

¹¹ *Ibid.*, Vol VII Letters No. CCXVII, CCLIV, CCLVIII, CCLX, CCLXI, CCLXIII, CCLXV, CCLXVI. Vol VIII Letters No CCCI, CCCLXIX, CCCLXXV, CCCLXXXIX, CDLXXXIX, D, DII, DV.

¹² From the Morgan Collection. Cf MA 24 Fénelon's Autograph Letters. Four pages, 19 3 x 13 6 cm., written on both sides (Graciously placed at our disposal by Miss Belle da Costa Greene, Director of the Morgan Library.)

signed and the person to whom it is addressed is not indicated. There is, however, no doubt as to its authenticity because it is in Fénelon's handwriting and the matter it contains shows clearly to whom it is destined and its relation to Jansenist polemical literature. This letter forms part of the secret correspondence between Fénelon and Le Tellier and concerns a phase of the dispute which centered about the acceptance in France of the Bull *Unigenitus*. At the request of Louis XIV, Pope Clement XI, on September 18, 1713, had promulgated the constitution *Unigenitus*, which condemned one hundred and one propositions of Quesnel's *Réflexions morales*. On September 28, 1713, in accordance with a formal promise made to the King, Noailles revoked his long-standing approbation of Quesnel's work, apparently terminating the quarrel. But, on October 16, 1713, in the second session of the Assembly of the Clergy called together at the instance of Fénelon and Le Tellier to discuss means for the proper reception of the Bull, Noailles nullified his previous gesture of submission by advocating its refusal, unless the Pope qualified with further explanations each error proscribed. The Cardinal then published his *Lettre Pastorale et Mandement* (February 25, 1714) forbidding the reception of the constitution *Unigenitus* in his diocese. Clement XI, on March 28, 1714, retaliated with a Brief censuring Noailles' act of insubordination. Thereupon, Fénelon, Le Tellier and the King discussed various means of ending this schismatic resistance and forcing the Archbishop of Paris and the twenty other bishops who had followed his example, to accept the Papal decree without any restrictions. Several suggestions, such as the calling of a national council, the deposition of Cardinal Noailles or his being sent to Rome to be judged, were made, but before any of them could be acted upon, the King died (1715), and Noailles triumphed for the time being.¹³

Although the present letter does not in any way change previous conclusions with regard to the Jansenist controversy, it contributes further evidence on the issues involved and the manner in which the secret negotiations concerning them were conducted. This letter, therefore, warrants reproduction because of its documentary value and also because of its importance as a contribution to any future critical edition of Fénelon's correspondence.

¹³ Cf. *Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique*, III, 103-7.

[Cambrai]¹⁴ le 17 aoust¹⁵ 1714

Je suis, Monsieur, touché et edifié de la délicatesse de M Bourdon¹⁶ sur les termes d'une Lettre¹⁷ que j'ai écrite Mais voici mes raisons, dont je le fais juge

1 J'écrivois une Lettre sans savoir le chemin qu'elle pouvoit faire. Dans le doute il convenoit, si je ne me trompe, de parler avec les plus grands ménagements sur un ho[mm]e en grande dignité,¹⁸ et actuellement réuééré de presque tout le public.

2 Plus on a besoin de dire des veritez, qui sont dures a un tel ho[mm]e, plus on doit les adoucir par des termes de menagement. C'est ainsi qu'on ne manque point de demander pardon a un ho[mm]e en dignité, quand on veut le contredire et le refuter Tout le monde comprend sans peine, que cette demande d'un pardon n'est qu'un compliment, et un langage de pure politesse

3. J'ai supposé que cette personne a *de la droiture et de la piété* mais cette supposition, loin d'affaiblir les veritez que j'auois a dire, les fortifioit et rendoit mes preuues plus pïessantes Ainsi j'ai crû satisfaire a la bien-seance par les termes geneiaux, sans manquer en rien a la bonne cause

4 Je devois sans doute plus qu'un autre user d'un grand menagement dans mes expressions Si j'y manquois on ne manqueroit pas de m'imputer du ressentiment et de l'acreté

5 Il est vrai que je refuserois l'absolution a un ho[mm]e, qui me paroitroit troubler la paix de l'église, et assurer la docilité qui est due aux decisions qu'elle prononce Mais je pourrois penser que son obstination viendroit de preoccupations pour de mauuois conseils, et d'un zeile qui iroit jusqu'a l'entestement, sans y ajoûter une mauuaise foi incompatible avec toute *droiture*, et toute *piété*

6. M Bourdon peut von de prez des faits que j'ignore de loin, et que je dois ignorer Le préjugé general, sur lequel je dois régler mon langage, est que la personne, dont il s'agit a vecû avec regularité et piété exemplaire Ses moeuis et son zeile sont en bonne odeur dans le public J'ai crû deuoir suivre ce préjugé dans une Lettre qui pouuoit être vue. Si M Bourdon connoit un detail de faits contraires a *la droiture* et a *la piété* que j'ai supposées, il peut parler en secret dans le besoin pressant, selon les preuues

¹⁴ The words and letters in brackets are mine.

¹⁵ The spelling, punctuation, accentuation and italics are Fénelon's.

¹⁶ Fénelon, *op. cit.*, VII, 337 *Fénelon au Duc de Chevreuse*. Cambrai, 25 mars 1711. "Pour le P Le Tellier, quand vous voudrez le nommer d'un nom qui ne fasse soupçonner aucun mystère, si par hasard on interceptoit nos lettres, vous n'avez qu'à l'appeler M Bourdon. Je ne doute nullement que le parti M le Cardinal de Noailles et le Roi même ne redoublent leur curiosité sur ses lettres "

¹⁷ The letter to which Fénelon here refers has apparently remained unpublished

¹⁸ Cardinal de Noailles, Archbishop of Paris.

convenantes qu'il a. Pour moi qui ne vois rien je m'acomode par bienveillance au prejugué public

7 J'avoue que M. Bouidon peut avoir ses raisons pour craindre que quelqu'un ne prenne dans un sens trop favorable les termes de ma lettre. Mais je consens qu'il ne monte point cette lettre aux personnes sur lesquelles elle pourroit faire une trop forte impression.

8 Je ne suis peut-être que trop sincère sur le fond des choses, quoique je cherche les expressions les plus radoucies, qui n'affaiblissent en rien le fond. C'est ce qu'on trouvera s'il plaît à Dieu, en toute occasion.

Il est capital de conclure au plus tôt une bonne paix qui donne une absolue sûreté pour la saine doctrine qui exclut à jamais tous les subterfuges du parti, et qui ôte tout ombrage pour l'avenir, et qui répare tout le passé. Si la paix manque il faut recourir sans perdre un seul moment, aux remèdes les plus efficaces.

La négociation, qui retardera la procédure, empêchera toujours la paix qu'on cherche. Au contraire la procédure est le seul moyen de faire réussir la négociation. Il faut que l'une ne retarde jamais l'autre.

Une réception qui seroit relative à une explication correcte ou tous les subterfuges du parti ne seroient pas rejetés de la manière la plus expresse et la plus décisive, demanderoient un acte authentique, et le retranchement inévitable de tout le parti même.

Une réception¹⁹ qui seroit relative à une explication très exacte, seroit encore très mauvaise. Elle ne blesseroit pas la doctrine, mais elle attaquerait l'autorité. Elle introduiroit l'usage des réceptions relatives, qui deviendroient bientôt arbitraires. Chaque Evêque se croiroit en droit de restreindre le jugement de l'Eglise par ses explications. Il demanderoit ou feroit lui-même des explications à l'infini. Il éluderoit la décision, pour sauver l'erreur condamnée.

On ne songe point sérieusement à sauver le Thomisme. C'est le système de Jansenius sur les 2 déclarations qu'on veut sauver par des explications²⁰. Vous verrez que les explications seront toujours ambiguës, pour sauver ce système.

BERNARD A. FACTEAU

College of Mount Saint Vincent

LE POÈLE DE DESCARTES

Dans un article brillant publié dans *Speculum*, xv (1940), 87 seq., M. von Wartburg réussit, par la méthode de la géographie linguistique, à localiser mieux que ses devanciers le célèbre *Capitulaire de*

¹⁹ Fénelon (*op cit*, VIII, 260-2) exprime des idées similaires sur cette question.

²⁰ Voir ses *Mémoires sur la nécessité et les moyens de ramener le Cardinal de Noailles et les autres Prélats Refractaires à l'avis de l'assemblée du clergé*.

²⁰ Cf. *Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique*, VIII, 319-530.

Vills il provient selon lui de la région portevine-angevine-saintongeaise, résultat qui gagnerait en portée, si l'on le comparait aux investigations de M. Gamillscheg (*Hauptfragen der Romanistik*, Festschrift Ph. A. Becker) sur l'indépendance relative de cette *Mischsprache* que fut le poitevin du moyen âge. Je ne noterai ici qu'une bévue de M. von Wartburg (p. 90), qui, tout en relevant de l'histoire littéraire, infirme une de ses assertions d'ordre linguistique.

Similarly for *pislum* [sc. "it includes the territory we have suggested"] The word *pensils*, in the meaning here involved of 'a room with a stove or fire-place,' occurs, for example, in Gregory of Tours, and the well-known passage from Descartes attests the word in the seventeenth century for the same territory [Poitou].

Le passage 'bien connu' de Descartes contient naturellement le mot français 'poêle' le *Discours de la Méthode*, II, 12 de l'éd. de 1637 nous apprend :

J'étais alors *en Allemagne*, où l'occasion des guerres qui n'y sont pas encore finies m'avait appelé, et comme je retournais du couronnement de l'empereur vers l'armée, le commencement de l'hiver m'arrêta en un quartier, où je demeurais tout le jour enfermé seul *dans un poêle*, où j'avais tout le loisir de m'entretenir de mes pensées

Il s'agit de ce moment solennel, et dans la vie de Descartes et dans l'histoire de la science, où le jeune philosophe fit sa découverte, en hiver 1619, à Neubourg sur le Danube, sur les frontières de la *Bavière*, des règles de la mathématique universelle. Par conséquent, notre passage ne peut rien prouver pour un *poêle* poitevin.

M. von Wartburg pense évidemment que Descartes, né en 1596 en Touraine et étant resté jusqu'à peu près l'âge de vingt ans dans cette région, a pu se servir d'un mot dialectal poitevin recueilli sur place. Toujours est-il que l'écart de mille ans entre Grégoire de Tours et Descartes est un peu grand. . . . Or, on sait que *poêle* dans le sens 'chambre chauffée par un poêle,' puis 'chambre commune, seule chauffée,' 'chambre à coucher,' se trouve anciennement attesté, non pas à l'ouest de la France, mais en Lorraine, Savoie, dans la Suisse romane, et se continue en Allemagne (a. h. all. *phesal*, m. h. all. *phiesel*, dialectes all. modernes : Holstein *pesel*, Bavière *Pfiesel*)¹ il s'agit d'une continuation de ces *balneae pensiles* des

¹ M. Frings, *Germania Romana*, p. 62 dit "Provinzialwort der *nordlichen Herztechnik* [je souligne!] ist auch *pensile* . . . zwischen den westschweiz,

Romains, auxquels se rattache le *pslum* du *Capitulare* et qui étaient chauffés par en-dessous, par la *hypocaustis* (Kretschmer, *Wortgeographie*, p. 508), système de chauffage s'opposant à celui des cheminées et des fourneaux. Si Descartes n'a donc pas trouvé *poêle* 'chambre chauffée' en Touraine, comment peut-il appeler ainsi les chambres allemandes? Le *Dictionnaire du parler neuchâtelois* de Pierrehumbert répond à cette question (s. v. *poile*)

Cette acception du mot n'est guère usitée en fr ou afr . . . , sauf chez les écrivains tel que Descartes, Montaigne, Carloix, etc. [*Voyage de Montaigne* 'Les Suisses sont sumptueux en *poiles*, c'est à dire en sales communes à faire le repas'] — Ce sens du mot étant bien établi en S[uisse] R[omande], Loir, Sav, Fche-Cté, Bresse . . . , pays de langue française, on s'étonne que l'*Acad* définisse *poile* ou *poêle* 'nom donné en *Allëmgne* et en *Hollande* à la chambre où est le *poêle*'. Il est bizarre d'invoquer des pays germaniques pour l'usage d'un mot franc

Aussi bien le Dict. de l'Académie de 1684 n'a-t-il pas encore cette définition ridicule (répétée d'ailleurs par Littré) cette première édition porte: "Se dit aussi de toute chambre où est le Poêle. *Entrer dans le poêle, en Allemagne on est presque toujours dans le poêle, toute la famille se tient dans le poêle.*" L'édition de 1798 porte: "Se dit aussi, *sur-tout en Allemagne*, d'Une chambre commune où. . . ." On voit par ces tâtonnements qu'avec le progrès du temps les notions exactes de *poêle* 'chambre' s'affaiblissaient de plus en plus.

Mon aimable collègue Lancaster attire mon attention sur un passage de son livre *A History of French Dramatic Literature*, III, I, 124, où il a traité de la comédie "Le cercle des femmes" de Chapuzeau dans cette adaptation des *Colloquia* d'Erasmus, à la scène publiée en 1656 (entretien 1), se trouve une description de l'accueil fait au voyageur dans une hôtellerie allemande:

Après s'être égaré de crier, il parait à la fin quelqu'un qui avance la tête hors de la petite fenêtre du Poesle, où ils demeurent volontiers jusqu'au solstice d'été, Et vous le prendriez proprement pour une tortue qui se montre de dessous sa coque. Ayant donné ordre à votre monture, vous vous transportez tout botté et tout crotté dans le Poesle, qui est commun pour tous, et vous vous y treuuez quelquefois jusques à quatre-vingt ou nonante de toutes conditions et de tous sexes . . .

lothr. und nordfranz. (*poêle*) Belegen der Romania, dem suddeutschen resthaften *phesal pfiesel* dem nordd.-ndd. *pisel pesel* ist die Verbindung eingestürzt In der Bedeutung 'Stube' stehen Westschweiz, Lothringen und Norddeutschland beieinander."

Ces passages correspondent textuellement aux phrases suivantes d'Érasme dans son dialogue *Diversoria* " . Bertulphus: tandem aliquis per fenestellam *aestuarii* (nam in his degunt fere usque ad solstitium aestivum) profert caput . . . totus commigras in *hypocaustum* . . . id est unum omnibus commune.—Gulielmus: Apud Gallos designant cubicula, ubi sese exuant, extergant, calefaciant, aut quiescant etiam, si libeat—Be. Hic nihil tale. In hypocausto exuis ocreas induis calceos . . . etc." (puis le mot *hypocaustum* est toujours répété, *aestuarium* ayant été employé seulement la première fois à cause du jeu étymologique avec *solstitium aestivum*).

On voit bien que dans cette description pleine d'humour du sage de Rotterdam le traducteur français devait employer un mot qui fût apparaître étrange pour un public parisien la façon de vivre des Tudesques 'dans un poêle': c'est *poêle* qui lui semble conférer la note de saveur rustique. M. von Wartburg dira-t-il que Chappuzeau, né à Paris, élevé à Châtillon-sur-Loing et à Genève, grand voyageur comme Descartes (Angleterre, Pays-Bas, Allemagne, Suisse et Italie), avait hérité ce vocable de sa famille poitevine (v. ces détails chez Lancaster, *l. c.*, p. 121)?

Le positivisme linguistique a une tendance vers la mystique du sol et du sang, alors qu'il ne fait pas autant de cas de la civilisation, de l'ambiance spirituelle. Mais doit-on, pour être né en Poitou ou descendre d'ancêtres poitevins, parler poitevin? Si Napoléon emploie le mot "idéologue," l'aura-t-il appris parmi les pâtres et bandits corses?

On peut donc conclure que pour un Descartes le mot *poêle* 'chambre chauffée' était un mot des patois français de l'Est, qu'il employait, logiquement, de la même 'chose' allemande; que, de la présence de ce terme dans le *Discours de la méthode*, on en peut aussi peu inférer le caractère poitevin-tourangeau que le caractère périgourdin de l'apparition dans Montaigne, et enfin, que le *psilum* du *Capitulare* ne prouve que ce que nous savons par ailleurs, à savoir que le *poêle* désignait d'abord un système de chauffage par 'calorifère' (*balneae pensiles*) et que le sens de 'fourneau' est secondaire.

LEO SPITZER

DIDEROT AND DONNE'S BIAΘANATOS

The opening paragraphs of the article *Suicide* of the *Encyclopédie* are somewhat surprising to anyone conversant with the *philosophe* attitude to the problem and with Diderot's attitude in particular,¹ for they are completely orthodox. About half-way through, however, the article turns to a review of John Donne's BIAΘANATOS, and though toward the end the remark is made that M. Donne's "system," "Ne sera certainement point approuvé par les théologiens orthodoxes," there cannot be much doubt as to the purpose of its intrusion.

The use of Donne's book is an example of a technique common enough in the 18th century to invite no comment, were it not for the fact that whoever wrote the article regarded BIAΘANATOS so completely as a means to an end that he went no farther than the title-page of the 1700 edition for his biographical information. In his haste to imply British tolerance he mistranslated even that, and the result is a statement that John Donne was made Dean of St. Paul's *after* the publication, in 1700, of a highly unorthodox work!² A comparison of the title-page—which is, but for the date, textually uniform with the previous editions of 1644 and 1648³—with the text of the *Encyclopédie* will show immediately what is meant:

BIAΘANATOS. A declaration of that Paradox, or Thesis, that Self-Homicide is not so naturally Sin, that It may never be Otherwise Wherein, The Nature, and the Extent of all those Laws, Which seem to be Violated by this Act, are Diligently Surveyed Written by John Donne; who afterwards Received Orders from the Church of England, and Died Dean of St Paul's,

Son ouvrage, écrit en anglois, a pour titre, BIAΘANATOS: *a declaration of that paradox (sic) or thesis, thas (sic) self-homicide is not so naturally sin & (sic) that it may (sic) never be otherwise, &c.* London, 1700, ce qui signifie, *Exposition d'un paradoxe ou système qui prouve que le suicide n'est pas toujours un péché naturel* Londres, 1700 Ce docteur Donne mourut

¹ See for example Diderot's letter to Sophie Volland, Oct 6, 1765, in which he discusses Hume's famous rescue from justice of a would-be suicide.

² The first printing of BIAΘANATOS in 1644 was of course 13 years after Donne's death.

³ See Keynes, Geoffrey, *Bibliography of the works of Dr John Donne*, Cambridge, 1914.

London - - -
the Year, 1700

London. printed in doyen de Saint-Paul, dignité à la-
 quelle il parvint après la publication
 de son ouvrage ⁴

The rendering of "is not so naturally sin" by, "n'est pas toujours un péché naturel," must surely have been an error of haste, of which there are other signs. But as for the rendition of, "Written by John Donne, Who afterwards . . . Died Dean of St. Paul's," by, "Ce docteur Donne . . . après la publication de son ouvrage," one wonders whether there was not intention mingled with ignorance. In any case, the total effect is amusing.

It need hardly be added that information as to Donne's biography was easily available in French at the time.⁵

ROGER B. OAKE

Brown University

AN ECHO OF OUR WAR WITH MEXICO IN A LEGEND OF THE DUQUE DE RIVAS

There is a reference to the war between the United States and Mexico in *La Azucena Milagrosa* of the Duque de Rivas that seems to have escaped the notice of scholars who have written about the Duke's works. Mr. E. A. Peers and M. Gabriel Boussagol have published full length studies of Rivas and his works,¹ and much is said in them about the poet's extreme affection for his land and all that pertains to it, as well as about his consequent coolness, if not forthright hostility, toward foreign lands, but neither Mr. Peers nor M. Boussagol makes anything of the reference I wish to call attention to. M. Boussagol, who is very insistent, wrongly, I think, on the animosity of the Duke toward England, apparently assumes that what I take to be a reference to the United States is merely a part of a reference to England.

⁴ The text of Donne is taken direct from the 1700 edition. That of the *Encyclopédie* is Geneva, Vol xxxii, 1779. That of Assézat and Tourneux makes minor corrections of spelling, but contains the "&" between "sin" and "that" which so alters the meaning of the original.

⁵ Moréri's *Dictionnaire* (ed. of 1759) contains a biographical article on Donne and there is a quite detailed biography in Nicéron's *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des hommes illustres*, Tome 8, 138-153, Paris, 1729.

¹ Peers, E. Allison, *Angel de Saavedra, Duque de Rivas, A Critical Study*, *Revue hispanique*, LVIII (1923), 1-601, and Boussagol, Gabriel, *Angel de Saavedra, Duc de Rivas, sa vie, son œuvre poétique*, Toulouse, 1926.

While the Duke was Queen Isabella's ambassador to Naples, he wrote in 1847 the longest of his three legends, *La Azucena Milagrosa*. In the course of this narrative he takes occasion to digress upon the exploits of his favorite Spanish hero, Hernán Cortés, who, he recalls,

plantó audaz el pabellón hispano,
Con gloria eterna de la patria suya,
En la opulenta Méjico, que el orbe
Del Occidente emperatriz titula ²

It happened that just when the Duke was writing this stirring tribute, General Winfield Scott was waging a successful military campaign against the Mexican Government. This fact intruded itself upon the poet's thoughts, and it was more than he could endure calmly, although Mexico had been independent of Spain for many years and had been so recognized by Spain herself for more than a decade. And so he breaks out into a lament, which changes to anger, and then to wounded reproach for the former children of Spain.

¡Ay! al trazar estos sonoros versos
Con noble orgullo la entusiasta pluma,
De tanta gloria mis ardientes ojos
En aquella región el templo buscan
Y la ven ¡oh dolor! presa infelice
De raza infiel, advenediza, obscura,
Que a la fe del glorioso Recaredo
Con sus dogmas heréticos insulta
Raza de mercaderes ¡Y no queda,
Y allí no queda ya gota ninguna
De castellana sangre, que valiente,
Tan horrenda agresión pame y confunda?
. . . Queda, sí, y se derrama valerosa,
Mas sin fuerza y poder La desvirtúan
Rebeliones, discordias, impiedades,
Delirios, ambiciones y disputas,
Que pérfida Albión, con larga mano,
Hundiéndolos en mar de desventuras,
Sembró en aquellos pueblos infelices,
Que niños son, y adultos se figuran ³

The mention of "*pérfida Albión*" has obscured the identity of the unnamed "*raza de mercaderes*" brought into the second

² *Obras Completas*, Madrid, 1894-1904, v, 260.

³ *Ibid.*, v, 260-61.

quatrain of the quotation, but it is perfectly clear that they are distinct. The poet's attention shifts between the beginning and the end of the passage. After considering present conditions in the first three quatrains, when he thinks of the defeat of men of Spanish blood and of Catholic faith by a "*raza infiel de mercaderes*," he turns in the fourth and fifth to the causes of these conditions and begins to think of the reasons these people can not defend their territory. At this point his thoughts go back a generation to the time when another country was actively, although somewhat surreptitiously, supporting their struggle for independence, and then "*pérfida Albión*" joins the "*raza de mercaderes*" on the pillory—and not until then.

The first line of the passage makes it clear enough that the thing that disturbed the poet was of the present—"al trazar estos versos"—and the third quatrain tells us that it was an "*agresión*." That Mexico is the scene of the aggression is clear from the first brief passage quoted above, and there seems to be no question that the "*raza infiel de mercaderes*" is the people of the United States. The adjectives "*advenediza*" and "*obscura*" seem to me further evidence, if it were needed, that the writer had North Americans rather than Englishmen in mind, for they are much more likely to be used about a young and distant people than about an old and aristocratic nation so close to Spain as England is.

The nation that Rivas most definitely disliked was France, yet nowhere in his narrative poetry can one find such sharp invective against the French as this against the North Americans. The events in Mexico brought to his mind a long series of reverses for the land he loved, and he became so indignant that he could not finish the sentence he had begun, "*Raza de mercaderes. . .*" Aristocrat that he was, however democratic he may have been personally, the ideals of the United States surely did not appeal to him, but this passage probably does not represent accurately his feelings toward this nation—it represents his attitude toward all nations, collectively, that had been in any way instrumental in Spain's fall from her former position of the highest importance among nations. That he uses certain adjectives which seem to apply specifically to the United States happens naturally because this country started his train of thought at the time

In so far as the United States was consciously in his mind, his wrath sprang up like a tinsel fire and died away as quickly, for his

published works contain no other reference. This bit of invective, then, does not seem to be due to any deep-seated and long-standing animosity toward this country. On the contrary, in 1834, we are told by Sidel Mackenzie,⁴ the Duke spoke of coming to this country when and if he should be obliged to spend another period in exile. The fact that, when the second emigration became necessary in 1836, he went to Gibraltar instead merely emphasizes his feeling for the homeland—he wanted to be as close to his country and his people as he could. It was the same reason that dictated his move from Malta to France in 1830, during his ten-year exile after 1823.

The University of South Carolina

THOS. A. FITZGERALD

A PROSE PERIOD IN SHAKESPEARE'S CAREER?

Since 1874, when Fleay published ¹ his tables of statistics on the mediums in which Shakespeare wrote his plays, these tables, supplemented and revised by several other students, have been often reprinted, and heavily employed in confirming our later notions of the chronological order of Shakespeare's works. Most of the stress, however, has been laid upon the verse elements. On another element, the prose, particularly in its relative proportion to verse, little attention has been focussed. When Henry Sharp made his valuable analysis of the uses which Shakespeare made of prose, he dismissed this matter of mere quantity thus:

The quantity of prose and metre used in a play does not appear to depend much upon the subject of the play . . . The time at which the plays were written does not appear to have much to do with the quantity. Roughly speaking, there is least prose in the early and late plays, and most in those in the middle as to date. The actual quantity of prose is not important.²

This was written in 1885, and in 1930 E. K. Chambers sums up the situation in much the same terms.

⁴ *Spain Revisited*, New York and London, 1836. Quoted by A. K. Shields in *Hispanic Review*, VII (1939), 145 ff.

¹ F. G. Fleay, *On Metrical Tests as Applied to Dramatic Poetry*, N. S. S. (1874), p. 16, *A Shakespeare Manual* (1876), p. 121. His tables, somewhat corrected, but according to Chambers "very far from accurate," were printed in C. M. Ingleby, *Shakespeare, the Man and the Book* (1881), II, 50.

² Henry Sharp, *The Prose in Shakespeare's Plays*, N. S. S. (1885), pp. 523-56.

There are no percentage tables for the distribution of prose, and probably none would be helpful. It is used throughout the plays, except in two or three of the histories, and appears to have no chronological significance. If it is commonest in the second period, the reason is that comedies, to which it is particularly appropriate, then come most thickly.³

These are weighty dicta, but the present writer, taking a hint from the fact that eleven of the twelve plays usually ascribed to the years between 1596 and 1604 show each over 1000 lines of prose, has worked out the percentages of which Chambers noted the lack; the results seem to set the significance of prose quantity in a new and sharper light. The tables below, based on Chambers's counts,⁴ more accurate and conscientious than Fleay's, are chiefly for what he classifies as the thirty-one Normal Plays.

CHAMBERS—NORMAL PLAYS

Before 1 *Henry IV*

Play	Total	Prose	%
2 <i>Henry VI</i>	3162	551	17.4
3 <i>Henry VI</i>	2904	3	00.1+
<i>Rich. III</i>	3619	83	2.3—
<i>C of E</i>	1777	244	13.7
<i>T G V</i>	2292	654	28.5
<i>R & J</i>	3050	455	14.9
<i>Rich. II</i>	2757	0	0.0
<i>M. N. D.</i>	2174	470	21.6
<i>K J</i>	2570	0	0.0
<i>M V</i>	2658	633	23.8
Total 10 plays	26963	3093	11.4+
<i>L L L</i>	2785	1051	37.7
Incl <i>L L L</i>	29748	4144	13.9

Middle Period (1595?—1604?)

1 <i>Henry IV</i>	3176	1493	47.0
2 <i>Henry IV</i>	3446	1813	52.6
<i>Much Ado</i>	2825	2105	74.5
<i>Henry V</i>	3381	1440	42.5
<i>J C.</i>	2477	176	07.1

³ E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare, a Study of Facts and Problems*, I, 257-8.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 398, Table I.

Middle Period (1595?-1604?)—Continued

Play	Total	Prose	%
A Y. L	2856	1659	58 0
Tw Nt	2690	1752	65.2
Hamlet	3929	1211	30 8
M W. W	3018	2664	88 2
T & C	3496	1188	34 0
All's Well	2966	1478	49 8
M for M	2820	1154	40 9
Total (12)	37080	18133	48 9
Excl J C	34603	17957	51 9
Excl J C Incl. L L. L	37388	19008	50 8+

After *Measure for Measure*

Play	Total	Prose	%
Oth	3316	685	20 6+
Lear	3328	925	27 8—
Macb	2106	158	07 5
A. & C	3059	287	09 3+
Cor.	3406	829	24 3
Cymb.	3339	526	15 8—
W T	3074	876	28 5
Temp	2062	464	22 5
Total—8 plays	23690	4750	20 0
Grand Total 31 Normal Plays	90518	27027	29 8

Note Except J. C—none in Middle Period below 30%
none in other periods above 28 5%

"ABNORMAL" PLAYS (Three)

Play	Total	Prose	%	
T. And.	2523	41	01 6	{ Proportions about same in Sh & non- Sh. parts.
T. of S.	2647	625	23 4	
Timon	2374	701	29.5	

COMEDIES OF FIRST FOLIO OUTSIDE PERIOD OF PROSE

Play	Total	Prose	%
T G V, C of E, M N D, T of S, M V, W T., Temp	16684	3966	23 8—
T & C, Cymb, not classified as Comedies in F. L. L. L treated as exceptional, per- haps belonging to Prose Period			

PLAYS SHOWING LESS THAN 10% PROSE

Play	Total	Prose	%
<i>Early</i>			
3 Henry VI			00 1+
Rich III			02 3
Rich II			00 0
King John			00 0
<i>Middle</i>			
Julius Caesar			07 1
<i>Late</i>			
Macbeth			07 5
A & C			09 3

In reference to Chambers' remark that prose is to be expected in comedy, it should be noted that amongst the twelve plays of this period there are three histories, two tragedies, and three so-called bitter comedies, and that in the early period, amongst eleven plays there are five comedies, yet an average of prose of only 13.9% or, omitting *L. L. L.*, 11.4%. Note also that the percentage for the comedies (apart from *L. L. L.*) of F that lie *outside* this group is only 23 8

Many points may be observed from an inspection of these tables, but for the present let us confine ourselves to three.

1. The chronology of the plays in this group as a whole being fairly well established both relatively and absolutely, these figures enable us to assert that Shakespeare had a decided leaning towards prose as a dramatic medium, for a period of about eight years centering on 1600.

2. The high percentage of prose in *L. L. L.* would therefore be

one more reason⁵ for giving that play in the form in which we have it (Q 1598. F) a relatively late date, certainly not much earlier than 1596.

3. Since *J. C.* is an instance, exceptional within this group, of a very low percentage of prose, perhaps its dating ought to be re-scrutinized.

Why Shakespeare should have employed so much greater proportion of prose in the writings of the middle third of his career, the present writer has not now more than conjectures to offer. And since the field of Shakespeare studies is already too full of such hazards, he will even keep his to himself.

LLEWELLYN M. BUELL

University of California at Los Angeles

A NOTE ON THE STAGE HISTORY OF BEAUMONT AND FLETCHER'S *LOVE'S PILGRIMAGE* AND *THE CHANCES*

An error regarding the stage history of two of Beaumont and Fletcher's romantic comedies, *Love's Pilgrimage* and *The Chances*, occurs in several of the more reputable studies of the Elizabethan theater. This misconception, which assumes a revival of each of these plays between 1623 and 1625, apparently has arisen from the incorrect identification of certain actors whose names appear in the stage directions of the first folio texts of these plays. In the first scene of Act II of *Love's Pilgrimage*, following the speech of the second servant: "Come in, sir," there appears in the first folio text the stage direction: "Enter two servants, *Rowl· Ashton*."¹ In IV, 1, of the same comedy, the direction "Joh Bacon ready to shoot off pistol" stands opposite the speech of the gentleman attendant on Marc-Antonio: "By Heaven you shall not do't!" The third stage direction embodying the names of actors occurs near the end of IV, i. Following a speech by Philippo which ends "Shall he be

⁵ See E. K. Chambers, *op cit*, I, 335, who assigns it to 1595, and R. Taylor, *The Date of Love's Labour Lost* (N. Y., 1932), who comes out for 1596.

¹ *Comedies and Tragedies Written by Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, Gentlemen*, . London . 1647.

render'd too?" is the direction "Enter a servant Rowl. Ashton." In III, 11, of *The Chances* in the first folio text the direction "Enter Rowl with wine" appears. It is generally assumed that these names appearing in the stage directions are those of the actors playing the roles, and that they were set up accidentally by a compositor who was using the theatrical prompt books of the King's Men as his copy for these plays. The names do not appear in the second folio texts.

The conclusion that *Love's Pilgrimage* and *The Chances* were revived between 1623 and 1625 originated with F. G. Fleay, who identified the "Rowl." of these stage directions as William Rowley, the Elizabethan dramatist and actor. He went out of his way to criticize Dyce's suggestion that "Rowl." may be an abbreviation for "Rowland."² Fleay had documentary evidence that William Rowley was a member of the King's Men between 1623 and 1625.³ He therefore assumed that Rowley must have appeared in revivals of *Love's Pilgrimage* and *The Chances* by the King's Men some time during this period. Evidence of this assumption is to be found in his *Chronicle History of the London Stage, 1559-1642*, in which he lists "Ashton" and "John Bacon" as members of the King's company between 1625 and 1626 appearing in *Love's Pilgrimage*.⁴

John T. Murray in his *English Dramatic Companies* followed Fleay's conclusions and listed revivals of *Love's Pilgrimage* and *The Chances* between 1623 and 1625.⁵ He accepted Fleay's identification of "Rowl." as William Rowley, and in a note declared, "As Rowley did not appear with the King's Men before 1623 or after 1625 this revival of 'Love's Pilgrimage' probably took place between those dates."⁶

Edwin Nungezer in his *Dictionary of Actors* likewise accepted the identification of "Rowl." as William Rowley, and listed him as appearing in *The Chances* and *Love's Pilgrimage*, which he "conjecturally dated" about 1624-25.⁷ Nungezer listed "Ashton" as

² *A Biographical Chronicle of English Drama* (London, 1891), I, 200

³ Rowley is listed in the second folio as one of the principal actors in *The Maid in the Mill* which was licensed for production in 1623 (see *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, ed. Joseph Q. Adams, p. 25), and in a Patent granted to the King's Men June 24, 1625 (see *Malone Society Collections*, I, 282).

⁴ (London, 1890), pp. 370-371 ⁵ (London, 1910), I, 172 ⁶ *Ibid.*, n. 14

⁷ *A Dictionary of Actors and Other Persons Associated with the Public Representation of Plays in England before 1642* (New Haven, 1929), p. 307.

an actor or stage-attendant "mentioned in the stage directions of Beaumont and Fletcher's *Love's Pilgrimage* (a revival by the King's Men about 1624-1625?)." "Joh Bacon" he interpreted as possibly "Job Bacon"; and to the assertion that Bacon also had appeared as an actor or stage-attendant in the 1624-1625 revivals of *Love's Pilgrimage* and *The Chances*, Nungezer added the note that this actor might be identified with a John Bacon named in a ticket of Privilege granted on January 12, 1636, to the attendants of the King's Players at Blackfriars.⁸

The assumption that *Love's Pilgrimage* and *The Chances* were revived in 1624 or 1625 rests, therefore, upon the presence of these three names, "Rowl.," "Ashton" and "Joh Bacon," and more particularly, upon the identification of "Rowl." with William Rowley, who was associated with the King's Men only from 1623 to 1625. It is possible, however, on the basis of documentary evidence to make other identification of these names which makes the assumption of revivals of these plays at this time unnecessary.

The first record of *Love's Pilgrimage* is to be found in the accounts of Sir Henry Herbert, the Master of the Revels. On September 16, 1635, Herbert's deputy received from the King's Men the sum of one pound for the "renewing of 'Love's Pilgrimage.'"¹⁰ This has generally been taken to mean that the play was being revived at this time, possibly in preparation for its performance on December 16, 1636, at Hampton Court (the only recorded performance of the play before the Restoration).¹¹ Since *Love's Pilgrimage* was one of the plays printed in the second folio without an actor list, it has generally been concluded that it was not originally produced by the King's Men, but later purchased and revived by that company.¹² That *The Chances* was produced by the King's Men in the 1630's is capable of proof since Herbert's records mention a performance of the play before the King and Queen at the Cockpit, November 22, 1638.¹³ Since *The Chances* was published

⁸ *Ibid.*, p 22

⁹ *Ibid.*, p 26

¹⁰ *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, p 36

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p 76

¹² See E. H. Oliphant's argument that every play originally produced by the King's Men (unless previously printed in quarto) is accompanied by an actor list in the second folio, "The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher," *Englische Studien*, xv (1891), 348

¹³ *Op cit.*, p 77

in the second folio without an actor list, it too was probably purchased and revived rather than originally produced by the King's Men.

The name of Rowland also appears in two other plays in the repertory of the King's Men during the 1630's. In v, 1, of the first folio text of *The Coxcomb* appears the direction, "Enter Mother, Alexander, Andrugio, and his man Rowland." *The Coxcomb* was printed in the second of the Beaumont and Fletcher folios without an actor list. Further proof that it was originally produced by another company and later passed into the hands of the King's Men appears in the record that it was acted at Court by the Children of the Queen's Revels in 1613.¹⁴ It was revived by the King's company for a royal performance at Hampton Court on November 17, 1636.¹⁵

The autograph copy of Philip Massinger's *Believe as You List*, which was used by the King's Men as the theatrical prompt copy, and which exists today as Egerton MS. 2828 in the British Museum, offers interesting evidence in connection with our problem. This play was originally licensed for production by the King's Men on May 7, 1631.¹⁶ In the stage directions of *Believe as You List* there are eleven references to either "Rowl" or "Rowland," these references being obviously to one and the same person, an actor who played a number of minor parts. The cast of characters prepared for the Malone Society reprint of the play lists "Rowland" appearing as "Demetrius" at line 1185; as a Carthaginian Officer at lines 732, 830, and 1116; as an attendant on Prusius at line 1362; as an attendant on Marcellus at lines 2367, 2632, and 2721.¹⁷ Particularly interesting are the directions on Folio 13A at line 1116 where Massinger's original stage direction reads, "the recordes brought in." In the right margin of the prompt book the prompter added the note, "Enter Rowland wth the records," and in the left margin,

¹⁴ See the record of Court payments listed in Rawl MS A 239 reprinted in E K Chambers' *The Elizabethan Stage*, iv, 181.

¹⁵ *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, p. 75.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

¹⁷ Malone Society edition of *Believe As You List*, ed C J Sisson (1927), pp xxx-xxi. Nungezer listed an actor by the name of "Rowland" appearing in the stage directions of *Believe as You List*, but did not identify him with the "Rowl" in the stage directions of *Love's Pilgrimage*, *The Coxcomb*, and *The Chances*.

to make doubly sure of the entrance, "Ent: Rowland with booke of records."

Each of the four plays in which the name "Rowl." or "Rowland" appears in the stage directions, it will be noted, was either revived by the King's Men or acted for the first time in the 1630's. *Love's Pilgrimage* was renewed by the Master of the Revels in 1635 and acted before the Court in 1636. *The Chances* was performed before the King and Queen at the Cockpit in 1638. *The Coxcomb* was produced at Hampton Court in 1636. *Believe as You List* was originally licensed for production in 1631.

A Ticket of Privilege for eleven of the King's Men was issued by the Lord Chamberlain on January 12, 1636. This document protected the actors and attendants named in it from arrest and molestation, and ordered any man having complaint against them to report to the Master of the Revels. Two of the eleven actors mentioned in this Ticket were named John Bacon and Rowland Dowle.¹⁸ Neither Bacon nor Dowle was listed in the Protection issued by Herbert to the King's Men in December, 1624.¹⁹

It now becomes clear that Fleay, Murray, and Nungezer were wrong in identifying the "Rowl." appearing in the stage directions of these plays as William Rowley. Rowland Dowle probably joined the King's Men as a minor actor and attendant some time after 1624. He acted in these plays in which his name has been preserved in the stage directions, and was still a member of the company when the Ticket of Privilege was issued in January, 1636.²⁰ Similarly, John Bacon joined the King's Men some time after 1624, and was still a member in January, 1636. His name appears only in the stage directions of *Love's Pilgrimage*. Of the actor "Ashton," whose name appears twice in the stage directions of *Love's Pilgrimage*, there is apparently no other record.

From this evidence, we see that it is no longer necessary to assume

¹⁸ Charlotte Stopes, "Shakespeare's Fellows and Followers," *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, XLVI (1910), 99

¹⁹ *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, pp 74-75

²⁰ William J. Lawrence, in his *Pre-Restoration Stage Studies* (Cambridge, 1927), p 390, correctly identified the "Rowl" of the stage directions of *Love's Pilgrimage* and *The Chances* as Rowland Dowle, but did not mention the occurrence of the name in *The Coxcomb* or *Believe as You List*, nor did he seek to refute the conclusion of Fleay, Murray, and Nungezer that *Love's Pilgrimage* and *The Chances* were revived in 1624 or 1625

that *Love's Pilgrimage* and *The Chances* were revived about 1624 or 1625 to account for the name "Rowl" appearing in the stage directions. The revivals in the 1630's, of which we have documentary proof, will suffice if we interpret "Rowl." and "Joh Bacon" as the Rowland Dowe and John Bacon who were members of the King's Men in 1636.

WILLIAM C. POWELL

University of Pennsylvania

NEW SOURCE INFLUENCE ON *THE SHOEMAKER'S HOLIDAY*

Thomas Dekker's impressment scene in *The Shoemaker's Holiday*¹ seems to have been influenced by the impressment scene in *The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth*². The actions of the entering groups are the same; ten situations and incidents appearing in the same sequence are the same, and though the dialogue is developed considerably more in Dekker's scene, there are general similarities in the speeches.

That Dekker used *The Famous Victories* scene as a stage unit is shown by the fact that he opened his own scene in exactly the same manner and strove for the same stage effects. 1. In both scenes there is noise of protesting and lamenting offstage. This directs the attention of the audience to the entrance. In *The Famous Victories* the stage is empty. In *The Shoemaker's Holiday* Lacy and Askew are on the stage, but they are blocked out of the field of interest by the offstage noise. The scenes in both cases belong to the entering groups. 2. The entrance action is identical. In *The Famous Victories* the Captain leads the lamenting John Cobler and his crying wife onto the stage and, turning back toward them, admonishes them to cease weeping and protesting with, "Come, come. . ." In *The Shoemaker's Holiday* Eyre leads the protesting Marge, Hodge, and Firk, and the weeping Jane and Ralph onto the stage and, turning back to them, orders them to cease with, "Leave whining, leave whining." There is the difference that one is the Captain and the other is the shoemaker, Eyre, but both are the

¹ 1600, sig B3; Rhys, Mermaid Series, p 11

² 1598, sig D4

central figures in the entrance action. Lacy is present in *The Shoemaker's Holiday*, but he does not figure in the action, nor is he of interest to the audience at this point, and each entering group is a stage unit in itself. The units function exactly alike up to the point when each group is completely on the stage.

In *The Famous Victories* the Captain continues his rôle of impressing officer. In *The Shoemaker's Holiday* Lacy must be brought into the scene group and back into the interest scope of the audience, and so he is introduced by Hodge with "Master, here be the captains."³ Then Lacy is included in the group and assumes the same rôle as the Captain in *The Famous Victories*. The action in the two scenes goes on with the same main situation and incidents in the same sequence.

The Famous Victories

1. The impressed man is a shoemaker

2 The impressed man's weeping wife is protesting

3. The Captain, John Cobler, and Cobler's wife enter with the latter lamenting

4 John Cobler asks to be released by the Captain

5 The wife pleads when the Captain refuses

6 The Captain remains firm in his refusal to release John.

7 Dericke, a comic, provides slapstick comedy in a fight with the wife.

(Incident of Dericke and the thief.)

8 Dericke urges John to come away and encourages him not to be afraid that they are so "base-minded" as to die among Frenchmen

9 Dericke urges the Captain to haste away.

10 John and his wife bid each other a fond and tearful farewell

The Shoemaker's Holiday

1 The impressed man is a shoemaker

2 The impressed man's weeping wife and others are protesting

3 Eyre and his household enter with all lamenting and being reassured by Eyre

4 Eyre asks Lacy to release Rafe (Firk intercedes, too)

5 Jane, Rafe's wife, pleads that Rafe be allowed to stay

6 Lacy disclaims that it is in his power to release Rafe

7 Firk, a comic, provides comedy by his remarks to and about Jane and Marge

8. Eyre praises Rafe's qualities as a soldier, and Hodge encourages him that he is a "gull" if he refuses to go (Lacy and Askew promise to aid Rafe)

9 Dodger and Askew urge Lacy to haste away

10. Rafe and Jane part sorrowfully with the pathetic incident of Rafe giving Jane the shoes

³ *The Shoemaker's Holiday*, 1600, sig. B3, Rhys, *op. cit.*, p. 11

All of this similarity in entrances, in types of characters, in incidents and situations, and in sequences could scarcely have been accidental or incidental.⁴

W. L. HALSTEAD

State Teachers College, Florence, Alabama

DONNE'S SUICIDES

Some classical examples of suicide included by Donne in the *Buathanatos*¹ and repeated in part in the *Devotions*² enable one to speculate about the poet's reading and his method of note-taking. In the *Buathanatos*, Donne describes the deaths of Petronius, Attilius Regulus, Codrus, Herennius, Coma, Hannibal, Demosthenes, Aristarchus, Homer, Othryades, Democles, Portia, Catullus Luctatius, Terence, Labienus, Zeno, Porcius Latro, Festus, Hippionas, Macer, Cassius Lucinius, and Charondas. Departing from his method of careful annotation, he provides only two marginal references and both of these are for Latin phrases borrowed from a classical text.³ When Donne considered suicide again in the *Devotions*, he gave the modes of self-destruction of Hannibal, Demos-

⁴ The validity of the contention of influence on Dekker is further established by the common elements in the two impressment scenes not inherent in the situation itself. (1) *The types of entrances and opening actions*, that a dramatist would have other possibilities in manner of opening such a situation is illustrated by Shakespeare's borrowing from the same *Famous Victories* scene but not using the same type of entrance. (2) *The presence of weeping, protesting wives*; Shakespeare did not use the weeping wife in his impressment scene in *2 Henry IV*. (3) *The presence of comic characters who act alike and furnish a low type of comedy in each scene*. (4) *The presence of characters, friendly to the impressed man, who urge him to be a soldier instead of sustaining him in his objection*. Dekker's impressment scene seems to owe more to *The Famous Victories* scene than does Shakespeare's scene in *2 Henry IV*, which by consensus of all research and opinion was influenced by the impressment in *The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth*.

¹ *Op. cit.* (Facsimile Text Society, 1930), pp 51-54.

² *Op. cit.* (Cambridge, 1923), p 69.

³ Donne ascribes the phrase *precum festmandi* to Tacitus, *Annales*, lib v, but in modern editions of Tacitus and in the sixteenth century editions in my possession, this reference is from liber vi, 29.

thenes, Herennius, Portia, and Coma and supplied the name and source reference of the last named ancient in the margin. Donne's reluctance to provide marginal references for these illustrations suggests that he had forgotten or did not know the ultimate sources of his information.

In his reference to the suicide of Coma in the *Devotions*, Donne indicates that this story can be found in the *Facta dictaque memoralia* of Valerius Maximus (IX. 12. ex. i), and one discovers that the same source will account for Donne's facts about Regulus (I. 1. lxiv), Codrus (V. 6. i), Herennius (IX. 12. vi), Homer (IX. 12. ex. iii), Portia (IV. 6. iv), and Charondas (VI. 5. iv). The story of the suicide of Petronius comes from Tacitus' *Annales* (XVI. 19), the account of Hannibal's poisoned ring from the *De Viribus Illustribus* of Aurelius Victor (XLII), the legend of Demosthenes' poisoned pen is found ultimately in Plutarch's life of Demosthenes, and the same author's life of Demetrius contains Donne's story of Democles and the boiling bath. For his matter on the death of Porcius Lato, Donne would have had to read either the commentary of Hieronymus on the *Chronicle* of Eusebius⁴ or the appended annotations to Suetonius' *De Claris Rhetoribus* which Casaubon printed in his 1595 edition of that author. The story of the death of Aristarchus was drawn from Suidas' *Lexicon* and that of Festus was suggested by Martial (I. 78). Other of Donne's accounts deviate so much from the classical sources that one is justified in assuming that Donne is following a later tradition.

All but three of Donne's examples may be tracked to some Renaissance compendium like those of Fulgosius, Zwinger, Sabellicus, or Textor; and for some of these illustrations, the Renaissance compendia are closer to Donne's facts than the ultimate source in classical literature or history. To produce his story of the end of Othryades, Donne would have had to combine the account of Herodotus (I. 82) with that of Valerius Maximus (III. 2. ex. iv), or he might have read his account as he has it in the 1562 edition of Textor's *Officina* (I, 8). Donne's account of the suicide of Terence may be compared with the classical and Renaissance encyclopaedic sources to suggest that Donne—for all his erudition—was not too careful about where he dipped up his lore.

⁴ *Op. cit.* (Berlin, 1875), II, 145.

Donne	Donatus	Textor
Poore Terence because he lost his 108 trans- lated Comedies, drown'd himselfe	Q Cosconius redeuntem e Graecia perisse in mari dicit cum (C et viii) fabulis conversis a Menandro, ceteri mor- tuum esse in Arcadia Stymphali sive Leuca- dia tradunt Cn Corne- lio Dolabella M Fulvio Nobiliore consulibus morbo implicitum aut ex dolore ac taedio amissarum sarcinarum, quas in nave praemise- rat, ac simul fabulorum, quas novas fecerat "Vita," <i>Commentum</i> <i>Terenti.</i>	P Terentius amissis cviij fabulis, quas e Graecis Latinas fece- rat, & converterat ex Menandro, se sub- mersit (I, 8v)

In similar fashion one notices that in his account of Hippionas and Bubalus, Donne's assertion that Bubalus was a painter is in the compendium tradition (Textor, I, 9) whereas Pliny's *Naturalis Historiae* (XXXVI. 5. iv. 12), the ultimate classical source, states that he was a sculptor. One also feels that Donne's account of the suicide of Festus and the description of Festus' disease is closer to the compendium tradition (Textor, I, 3v) than to Martial, the only classical source.

Donne's reliance, however, on the Renaissance tradition can be neatly demonstrated by a confusion of sources which trapped him into writing about Cassius Lucinius Macer as if he were two men.

<i>Macer</i> bore well enough his being called into question for great faults, but hanged himselfe when hee heard that <i>Cicero</i> would plead against him. . . .	Lucinius Macer praetorius repe- tundarum postulatus, ubi per nun- cium intellexit Ciceronem sibi ad- versari, faucibus laqueo constrictus. . . . (Textor, I, 2v)
And so Cassius Lucinius to escape <i>Cicero</i> 's judgement, by choaking himselfe with a napkin . . .	C Lucinius Macer. . . . Ac proti- nus sudario, quod forte in manu habebat, ore et faucibus coarctatus. (Val. Maximus, xii, 7)

In this case what has happened is reasonably clear. Donne, like most of his contemporaries, probably kept a notebook in which he jotted down material that he hoped to use. Reading Valerius

Maximus, he extracted from that author his most famous suicides, from some compendia, he picked up other examples. A little carelessness in copying would result in errors like the one we have just described.

That Donne worked from notes rather than from printed sources is suggested by other examples. Catullus Luctatius according to Donne, died by swallowing burning coals, but classical (Val. Maximus, IX. 12-14) and Renaissance (Textor, I, 5) sources state that he suffocated himself in his closet.⁵ A similar variation is found in the case of "the Poet Labienus," who according to classical (Seneca, *Controversiae*, praef. V) and Renaissance accounts (Textor, I, 5) was neither a poet nor a suicide by self-immolation. Both of these variations may be the results of errors in transcribing or of *lapsus mentis*; it is also possible that Donne is following an unknown Renaissance tradition. That Donne had a tendency to grasp the general notion of his reading rather than to reproduce it accurately is demonstrated by a direct quotation from Diogenes Laertius which Donne incorporates in his description of Zeno's suicide. For his source Donne probably used Casaubon's 1593 translation, which at that time was the only one to be had.

Donne	Casaubon's Diogenes
For which act, <i>Diogenes Laertius</i> proclaims him to have been (<i>Mira felicitate vir, qui incolumnis, integer, sine Morbo excessit.</i>)	Re enim vera omnes praecedebat . . . magnaeque per Iouem felicitate Quippe nonagesimooctavo aetatis anno vita excessit incolumnis atque integer, ac sine morbo (P. 453)

One can conclude that Donne was not particularly discriminating about the origin of these illustrations and derived them from the classics and from contemporary⁵ sources without bothering to check the correctness of the contemporary accounts by the classical originals. He seems to have kept some type of notes from which he wrote and which like so many notes became in time "too cold" to

⁵ An excellent example of the same thing on a lower level is found in Dekker's list of fortunate and unfortunate in *Old Fortunatus*, I, 1, 192-230. Dekker had undoubtedly read Le Prismaudaye's *Académie Française* and had drawn from his essay on Fortune some characteristics of the goddess and the examples of Henry, Lewis I, John of Leyden, Bajazet, and Tamburlaine. A glance at the *fortunati* section of a compendium would have added Viriat and Primislaus, the other characters were probably supplied by Dekker's general knowledge.

be trustworthy.⁶ Our final conclusion is that Donne was probably not so great a classical student as some modern scholars would have him be.

DON CAMERON ALLEN

Duke University

AN EARLY EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY RHYMED PARAPHRASE OF *PARADISE LOST*, II, 1-225

A hitherto overlooked rhymed paraphrase of *Paradise Lost*, II, 1-225, appeared in an anonymous poetical miscellany¹ in 1708. Its full title reads. "The Speeches of the Devils from Milton—Paraphras'd and turn'd into Rhyme, feign'd to be spoken in a Council of War, consisting of Lucifer, Rymmon, Moloch, Belial, Asmodai, Adramelech, and Ramiel." Only the harangues of the first four devils listed in the title are included.

The paraphraser extends the ten introductory lines of Book II to sixteen, and begins thus.

High on a Throne, with dreadful Splendor bright,
Adorn'd with lucid Beams, and azure Light,
Sat *Lucifer*, the proudest Power which fell,
Son of the Morning, and the Prince of Hell,
By Merit rais'd to a Command so sad,
Amongst ten thousand eminently bad

There follows Lucifer's speech. I quote its opening lines as further illustrative of the paraphraser's fondness for antithesis and skill in emasculating his original:

Seraphick Powers, Lords of the World below,
O! very Gods, or worthy to be so,
Dominions, States, the early Sons of Light,

⁶ See *Biathanatos*, (*) 2r, for Donne's own admission that he wrote from cold and unchecked sources.

¹ The miscellany, entitled *Reflections, Moral, Comical, Satyrical on the Vices and Follies of the Age*, was issued in twelve parts between July 26, 1707, and April 13, 1709. It appeared in periodical form and was advertised as written "by several good Hands." The paraphrase is in the sixth part. This miscellany is not listed in Case's bibliography. Dr. R. C. Boys refers to it but does not mention the paraphrase. (See his unpublished doctoral dissertation, *English Poetical Miscellanies, 1700-25*, Johns Hopkins University, 1939, pp. 378-9.)

Now Peers of Hell, and mighty Kings of Night
 If brave our Freedom will our Loss atone,
 No longer passive to a haughty Throne,
 That's worth our Fall
 What Spirit's here, so far from being brave,
 That would his Honour quit a Heaven to save,
 And yield to be an humble glitt'ring Slave.

Belial's well-known lines,

for who would lose
 Though full of pain, this intellectual being, .

are turned into

For what aetherial Spirit is so low,
 So broke and wasted with infernal Woe
 At once to wish for that oblivious shore,
 Where Thoughts are lost, and Reason is no more?

The paraphrase is concluded with a brief speech by Rymmon which is based on the counsel of Beelzebub in *Paradise Lost*.

The University of Wisconsin

M. MAURICE SHUDOFKY

DISRAELI AND JOHN GIBSON LOCKHART

The most grandiose of young Benjamin Disraeli's youthful grandiose schemes, that of establishing a great daily newspaper that would rival *The Times*, brought him in contact with John Gibson Lockhart, Scottish barrister and *littérateur*. Not yet twenty-one at the time, Disraeli was a handsome and personable youth of undeniable talents; and so persuasive was he that he had succeeded in enlisting the great publisher John Murray in his scheme. Murray, for reasons that are obscure, was determined that Lockhart should edit the paper, christened by Disraeli *The Representative*, and accordingly sent Disraeli north to Scotland in September, 1825, to negotiate with Lockhart.

Disraeli was courteously received by Lockhart and, according to his own report, was soon on intimate terms with him. A hitch nevertheless soon developed in the negotiations, for according to the notions of the time one of Lockhart's station in life could not edit a newspaper without loss of caste. Eventually, however, a compromise arrangement was effected whereby Lockhart accepted

the eminently respectable editorship of *The Quarterly Review* (also published by Murray) at a salary of £1000 per year and further agreed "to the best of his skill and ability to aid and assist" Murray in the operation of the newspaper, and "by all other means consistent with his rank in life to promote the sale and character" of it.¹ In return for what was actually the editorship-in-chief without the onerous title, Lockhart was to receive £1500 a year.

The Representative came into being in January, 1826, but after the preliminary negotiations Disraeli drops out of the picture, undoubtedly forced out by his inability to put up his share of the capital at the proper moment. (He was deeply involved in trading shares on the stock exchange at the time and had been completely wiped out by the December crash.) But Murray was too deeply committed to withdraw. Badly edited and wretchedly managed, *The Representative* floundered on to an early death in July, seven months after its initial appearance, leaving the unfortunate Murray with a loss of some £26,000.

From the moment of the initial difficulties of *The Representative* there was a rapid cooling of the pleasant relationship between Disraeli and Lockhart, the more understandable after the failure of the paper, by which Lockhart not only lost an income of £1500 a year but suffered the humiliation of being associated with a notorious fiasco. He was perhaps but human if he blamed Disraeli for involving him in the affair. He was less than honest, however, if he were guilty, as Disraeli always felt, of misrepresentation in connection with *The Representative*. Disraeli's accusations against Lockhart, made many years later in a letter to Francis Espinasse, were published in the *Athenaeum* during his own lifetime, but after the death of Lockhart. As they appear in none of the biographies of Disraeli, they are worth reprinting:

March 27, 1860

. When I was quite a youth, I made the acquaintance of the late Mr. Lockhart, and hung about him, as boys do about the first distinguished man with whom they become acquainted. In the year 1825, Mr. Lockhart, who then lived in Scotland, undertook, with the countenance of Mr. Canning, to edit the *Representative* newspaper. In making his preliminary arrangements, he often made use of me, and I was delighted with his con-

¹ Monypenny and Buckle, *Life of Benjamin Disraeli*, New York, 1929, I, 72. A full account of the *Representative* affair is given in this work.

fidence. Sometime after, when in Italy, I took up an English magazine, and found "a son of Mr Disraeli" described as the Editor of the paper, I never wrote a line in the paper, I was never asked to write a line in the paper. At the time of its appearance, I did not know I could write. But the mythus was established, and effected its object, it shielded Mr. Lockhart, who was an expert in all the nebulous chicanery of these literary intrigues. Unfortunately, in this case, the man of straw he had fired on, became eminent, and a newspaper of nearly forty years ago is remembered from its being the subject of a literary forgery.²

It is apparent from this letter that Disraeli suspected Lockhart, whether justly or not, of shifting the responsibility for the failure of *The Representative* from his own shoulders to those of Disraeli, where it could not possibly belong. Under these circumstances it was but natural that Disraeli should thereafter remain suspicious of Lockhart and avoid all personal contact with him. In December, 1832, however, he thought he saw additional cause for complaint against Lockhart, as is set forth in the following unpublished letter of Disraeli to Lockhart:

December (?), 1832

and Young Dukes no longer "wine" with Marchionesses of Bucklersbury
Sir:

I have long been aware of the hostile influence (to use no harsher term) which you have exercised over my literary career, but I have hitherto passed it by unnoticed because I have a distaste to literary squabbling and because I feel confident that if I possess any genuine power I must ultimately prevail against even my most ungenerous opponents.

In the recently published number of the *Quarterly Review* you have by one of those sidewind sneers for which I have been often indebted to you held me up to ridicule as using a phrase in a book called the *Young Duke*³ which is not to be found in that work. I have deserved severe criticism, I have certainly experienced it, and I hope I have profited by it. This, however, is not criticism, and considering the quarter from where it emanates I can only view it as a personal and offensive allusion and one which to pass over in silence would not so much indicate that spirit of patient resignation becoming a youthful writer, but rather a degree of cowardice unbecoming one who has any regard for the respect of society or himself.

I am therefore under the very painful necessity of requesting an explanation from you upon this subject.⁴

Lockhart's sidewind sneer, if indeed he is the author of it, occurs

² From a copy of the letter preserved by Disraeli.

³ Disraeli's second novel.

⁴ From a copy preserved by Disraeli.

in a highly complimentary review of Morier's *Zohrab*, which he calls the "best novel that has appeared for several years past." After roundly condemning the recent wave of fashionable novels and announcing that their bubble has been pricked by the improvement of the public taste, the reviewer continues: "Young dukes will not again be caught inviting Marchionesses of Bucklersbury to 'wine' with them. . . ." ⁵

Lockhart replied as follows:

London, the 29th Dec. 1832

Sir.

If the reviewer of *Zohrab* in the last number of the *Quarterly* has ascribed the phrase you mention to *one* of your heroes in place of *another* of them, and if on reflection you would wish his I am sure involuntary mis-statement to be corrected, it shall be done in the next number of the review.

As to myself I disclaim entirely the feelings with respect to yourself which your letter seems to impute to me. I am unconscious of having exerted any influence, one way or another, on your literary career. I am of opinion that you must have been grossly misinformed as to some transaction of which I knew nothing ⁶

Disraeli refused the offer of a correction in the manner offered. "As I feel I have the assurance of the writer of the review of *Zohrab* that the misstatement was involuntary," he wrote, "I am of course precluded from any additional word." ⁷ The matter would hardly have ended there, however, had Macvey Napier, editor of *The Edinburgh Review*, responded favorably to Disraeli's offer to review *Zohrab* for *The Edinburgh*. The novel was praised in *The Quarterly*, Disraeli told Napier, because *The Quarterly* was edited by a "tenth-rate novelist." ⁸ Napier cautiously replied that he should not like to print an article that would give substance to the charge that *Zohrab* was cast up by *The Edinburgh* because it was extolled in *The Quarterly*, or one bearing any direct allusion to the literary merits of Lockhart. Thereupon Disraeli dropped the matter.

C. L. CLINE

The University of Texas

⁵ For all this, see *The Quarterly Review*, XLVIII, 391 ff

⁶ From the Beaconsfield archives at Hughenden Manor

⁷ *Ibid*

⁸ Andrew Lang, *The Life and Letters of John Gibson Lockhart*, John C. Nimmo, London, 1897, II, 77.

THE FRIENDSHIP OF CHAUCER'S SUMMONER AND PARDONER

In lines 669-70 of the Prologue to the *Canterbury Tales*, immediately after the description of the Summoner, Chaucer tells us:

With hym ther rood a gentil PARDONER
Of Rouncival, his freend and his comper

The last five words of this quotation take on unsuspected significance when placed beside a document which forms part of the register of John de Grandisson, Bishop of Exeter from 1327 to 1369. The document in question is dated 1355, and the pertinent part of it runs as follows:¹

nos, tamen, non sine gravi cordis inquietudine, ex querelis, denunciacionibus, et clamoribus plurium et facti quasi notorietate, intelleximus, et in parte ex inspeccione cedularum hujusmodi experti sumus, quod vos, Archidiaconorum Officiales, vestrive Commissarii et Registrarii, seva cupiditate dampnabiliter excecati, peccunie sic collecte vel verius seductoris totam [et e toltam] vobis, pro iniquo labore, sub colore infidelis feodi reservantes, questores hujusmodi tam Hospitalis Sancti Spiritus, Sancti Johannis, quam aliorum privilegiatorum, ut dicunt, nedum Fratres aut Clericos set multociens laicos aut conjugatos, ipsorum negocia diebus solempnibus, intra Missarum Solemnia, predicandi officio, [quod] non inferioribus diaconibus est permissum, tenore presumpto publice exponeie non tantum permittitis set ipsis nephandissime assistitis, consulitis, et favetis

From this passage we can tell that it was sometimes through connivance with the archdeacon's officials that the false pardoner was able to make "the persoun and the peple his apes"; and being familiar with Chaucer's objective method of satire, his habit of never drawing a damaging conclusion that he can trust his intelligent contemporary reader to draw for himself, we scarcely need further evidence of Chaucer's intention.

CHARLES R. SLEETH

Princeton University

¹ *The Register of John de Grandisson, Bishop of Exeter (A D 1327-1369)* Ed. by the Rev F C. Hingeston-Randolph, M A. Three volumes, London and Exeter, 1894-1899. Vol. II (1897), pp. 1178-79

The same passage is also cited by G. R. Owst (*Preaching in Medieval England*, Cambridge, 1926, pp. 103-04 and note), with a reference to pardoners and archdeacon's officials in general, but naturally not to Chaucer's Pardoner and Summoner in particular.

A SUPPLEMENT TO ZARNCKE'S NOTE ON BRANT'S
NARRENSCHIFF, CAP. 13, 1

Chapter Thirteen of the *Narrenschiff*, in which Brant launches a severe attack on "buolschaft," is replete with difficulties of one sort or another. Not the least among these occurs in the very first line, where the adjective "strowen" is used with reference to "Frow Venus". Zarncke, whose monumental edition clears away many of the difficulties, particularly those of a more philological nature, does not fail the reader in the above instance. He comments as follows (p. 322) on the meaning of "strowen" as applied to Venus "die redensart. stroh und feuer zu einander thun. zur bezeichnung der leichten entzündlichkeit (vgl. zu 92, 1), wird vielfach auf das gefährliche des zusammenlebens von personen mannlichen und weiblichen geschlechts angewandt". He then proceeds to give quotations to this effect, chiefly from the works of Hans Sachs, Seb. Franck, and Fischart. In this connection he makes the remark (p. 323), "auch Luther bedient sich dieses bildes mehrfach, wenn ich nicht irre." However, he is unable to provide definite citations.

It was the good fortune of the present writer to come upon the following passages in Luther, which Zarncke may have had in mind without being able to locate them when he was preparing his edition:

1. In the sermon *Vom ehelichen Leben* (1522) Luther takes issue with the following ecclesiastical regulation:

... wenn es geschehe, das eyn man mit seyns weybs mutter odder schwester sundigete, wilchs fur der ehe eyn laster were, das die ehe hynderte unnd tzu rysse, aber nu es nach der ehe geschicht, nicht tzureyssen kan umb des weybs willen, das keyn schuld dran hatt, Szo soll doch des manns straff seyn, das er bey seym weyb liege und nicht macht hab, die ehe schuld tzu foddern. Da sihe, was der Teuffel durch seyne narren ynn der ehe schafft, legt man und weyb tzusamen und spricht Sey keyn man noch weyb, *feur und stro* bey eynander und gepeutt, es soll nicht brennen. (WA 10 II, 284).

2. In a sermon of August 10, 1522, Luther, contrasting the commandments of God with those of the Pope, makes this observation:

Sich da seindt die Gepott Gottes unnd des Babsts wider eynander, das verstehet yderman wol. Also mit dem Eelichen standt. Got hat gebotten

das man und weyb ein fleysch sol sein unnd das sie nicht geschayden sollen sein Nun hatt der Babst vil der gepot dar wider geben, als wan eine den nimt der sie auss der tauft hot gehaben, so sol man im die ee zureissen, . . . Item wenn ymands in blut schanden felt und vereelichet sich mit seiner frundin, da gebeutt er sie sollenn bey einander beleiben, da lest er zwey nackete in einem bette bey einander ligen und solt keins von dem anderen nicht macht haben eeliche pflicht zu forderen Was ist das anders als wenn ich *stro und fewr* zusammen legt und verbute in doch, das nicht solten brinnen? (WA 10 III, 265)

3. In the famed address *An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation von des christlichen Standes Besserung* (1520) the following passage is found in Luther's discussion of the celibacy of priests:

. . . Es kan yhe nit ein yglicher pfar eynis weybes mangeln, nit allein der gebrechlichkeit, szondern viel mehr des hauszhalten halben Sol er den ein weyb halten, und yhm der Babst das zulessit, doch nit zur ehe haben, was ist das anders gethan, dan ein man und weyb bey einander allein lassen, unnd doch vorpieten, sie solten nit fallen, Eben als *stro und fewr* zusammen legen, und vorpieten, es sol widder rauchenn noch biennenn? (WA 6, 442).¹

HEINZ BLUHM

Yale University

DAD SOW

Although unauthorized variations of one sort or another, more or less unintentional of course, are not infrequently accredited to ballad-collectors in recordings from oral tradition, the outright creation of a ballad character is a distinct achievement. And Sharp's Dad Sow, in stanza one of *The Carrion Crow*, would seem to be such a character.

He shot it at that carrion crow,
And missed his mark and shot Dad Sow¹

Dad Sow appears thus also in the later printing of the song.²

The words *crow* in the first line of the song and *hogs* in its chorus³ are both common nouns, and are treated as common nouns

¹ Italics in the three quotations are mine.

² Olive Dame Campbell and Cecil J. Sharp, *English Folk Songs from the Southern Appalachians*, 1917, p. 320

³ Maud Karpeles, ed., *English Folk Songs from the Southern Appalachians*, 1932, II, 324.

⁴ Campbell and Sharp, *op. cit.*, p. 320.

in common practice, a practice also followed by Sharp. A different treatment he accords Dad Sow, who as presented must be regarded as a ballad character.

That the singer, however, had in mind *dad's sow*, not Dad Sow, is clear from stanza two of the song.

He carried her up into the house,
And had a good mess of cheese and souse ⁴

Otherwise the situation presented in the song seems most extraordinary. On the parricidal score, Synge's extravaganza, *Playboy of the Western World*, falls short of a "good mess of cheese and souse."

West Virginia University

LOUIS W. CHAPPELL

REVIEWS

Christopher Marlowe A Biographical and Critical Study. By FREDERICK S. BOAS. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, New York: Oxford University Press, 1940. Pp. viii + 336. \$4.50.

This most interesting and useful work will be welcomed by all students of Elizabethan drama and deserves a place on the shelves of all college libraries. It is the final fruit of some forty years of study by the author of the life and work of Marlowe and is a synthesis of all the investigations which, since Hotson's epoch-making discovery in 1925, have thrown so much light on the stormy career of the Elizabethan poet and dramatist. Little new matter is added; perhaps none was to be expected. Certain documents reproduced for the first time in facsimile, the Coroner's inquisition and parts of Bames's note, are of little help to the average reader or even to the student. To put it frankly these reproductions are little better than illegible. Yet both are of the highest importance, the inquisition might have been printed in full with a translation, since the crabbed Latin of Elizabethan legal documents is not always easily understood by the modern reader. Hotson, to be sure, had already done this, but his invaluable little book is not always easily accessible. Brooke has printed the Bames note in full in the appendix to his *Life of Marlowe*. It is not exactly pleasant reading, but it is a necessary document, the extracts printed by Dr. Boas omit the

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 320.

"revolting allegations against Christ and St. John"; yet these are part and parcel of the charge of condoning homosexuality brought against Marlowe. It may not be true, but his work, especially *Dido* and *Hero and Leander*, shows his interest in this abnormal sex-relation

On the other hand Dr Boas includes a good deal that has already appeared in print and that has only the slightest bearing on the life of Marlowe. A whole section (12 pp.) is devoted to Robert Poley, the notorious Government agent. Now Poley was present at the death of Marlowe and it was probably his testimony that established in the minds of the Coroner's jury the fact that Frizer had acted in self-defence. A couple of paragraphs characterizing Poley and quoting his frank avowal that he would swear and forswear himself rather than accuse himself to his own harm would be sufficient, one thinks, to throw light upon his credibility as a witness. As Dr. Boas admits (p. 116) there is no documentary proof that Poley had even met Marlowe before the day of the poet's death. It seems also hardly necessary to print the "main provisions" of the will of the widow Grace Baines (1597); all that matters is that there is no mention in her will of her son Richard, who was therefore presumably dead, and who *may* therefore be perhaps identified with the Richard Baynes hanged at Tyburn in 1594. Frankly a good deal of the documentary matter printed or re-printed in the book seems somewhat superfluous.

In regard to the actual circumstances of Marlowe's death Dr. Boas like most recent writers is inclined to suspend judgment. We have, as he points out, only one version of the affray and Poley, from whom it probably comes, is a most suspicious character. On the other hand there is no conceivable motive why Marlowe should have been deliberately trapped and murdered, and the verdict that Frizer struck in self-defence was received as satisfactory by all concerned. The Queen promptly pardoned him; and Walsingham, Marlowe's patron, retained him in his service. Poley, too, continued his activities as a Government messenger, interrupted—why no one knows—to spend a day in a tavern with Marlowe and the others. Perhaps after all the best thing is to accept the statement of the verdict that Marlowe, *ira motus*, began the fray which ended in his death.

In the critical chapters of the book Dr. Boas stresses perhaps more strongly than any other writer has done the profound influence of the classics—Latin poetry in particular—on Marlowe's thought and style. This influence is all-pervasive from his translation of Ovid's *Amores*, probably written while he was still at Cambridge, to *Hero and Leander* begun and left unfinished in the last months of his life. It is to this influence that Dr. Boas attributes the "lucidity and precision which translate thoughts and emotions into rhythmical speech with felicitous exactness." Moreover Dr. Boas brings together

a convincing amount of testimony to show that Marlowe was a widely read student of modern as well as of classic literature, admired for his learning even by those who, like Chettle, disliked him personally. All this is to the good and serves to modify the picture presented of him in a recent work as an Elizabethan swash-buckler "bloody, bold, and resolute."

It is in his treatment of Marlowe as a playwright that Dr. Boas seems least satisfactory. He still adheres to the 1592 date for *Dr. Faustus*. I expressed my lack of conviction with the evidence held to establish that date in a review of the author's edition of *Faustus* in *Modern Language Notes*, June 1933, and I have seen no reason to change my opinion. There is no need to repeat my argument here, but I may point out that the chronology of Marlowe's plays accepted by Dr. Boas runs as follows: *Tamburlaine* (both parts) 1587; *The Jew*, 1589, the *Massacre* late in 1592; *Edward II* somewhere in that year, and *Faustus* after May 1592. This seems so curious as on the face of it to be unlikely. It is hard to believe that, after the instant success of *I Tamburlaine*, which provoked an immediate second part, Marlowe should have been silent for nearly two years. Again there is an unexplained silence from 1589 to 1592, in which latter year according to Dr. Boas Marlowe wrote no less than three plays. I would propose, what seems to me a more probable chronology: *Tamburlaine I and II* 1587, *Faustus* 1588; *The Jew* 1589, the two-part play mis-represented by the *Contention and True Tragedy*, in 1590-91—it was on the boards, as we know from Greene, by the summer of 1592—the hasty hack-work of *The Massacre*, 1592 and his most perfect play *Edward II* later in that year. This, of course, is to assume that Marlowe had read a copy of P. F.'s translation of the German Faust book before the date of its first recorded edition, May 1592. I would venture the suggestion that Marlowe might have seen it in manuscript in the hands of Jeffes, its first printer, who was also the printer of *The Spanish Tragedy* and whom Marlowe may have met through Kyd. This proposed chronology also assumes Marlowe's hand in the *Contention and True Tragedy*. It seems unfortunate that Dr. Boas, who notes (p. 196) that the frequent classical quotations in these plays—and in their later versions, 2 and 3 *King Henry VI*—are "in accord with the usual practice of Marlowe and not of Shakespeare," does not go on to a bolder attempt to assert Marlowe's authorship—part-authorship at least along with Shakespeare—of the original that lies behind both the early quartos and the final versions of the Folio. It is a pity, I think, that instead of this he makes an attempt to ascribe *Arden of Feversham* to Marlowe, an attempt not likely to meet with sympathetic response from students of Elizabethan drama.

In general it may, I think, be said that Dr. Boas' treatment of Marlowe's plays, *qua* plays, is superficial rather than searching. He

tells the story of each play at considerable length, interrupting his narrative by frequent quotations. This is entertaining rather than enlightening. He seems oblivious of the great advance in dramatic technique shown in Marlowe's progress from *Tamburlaine* to *Edward II*. He asserts (p. 312) that Marlowe "paid little attention to the articulation of the plot", but that is exactly what Marlowe did in *The Jew*, it is a dramatic device which one believes he learned from Kyd whose *Spanish Tragedy* is the best plotted of early Elizabethan plays, to say nothing of Kyd's lost *Hamlet*. Some mention might have been made too, of Marlowe's daring innovation in promoting such a subordinate figure as Kyd's villainous Lorenzo to the protagonist, the villain-hero, of *The Jew*. The final statement that Marlowe "founded no school" (p. 314) and that Shakespeare's "obligation (to him) does not go deep" seems strangely to ignore Marlowe's positive contribution to Elizabethan tragedy in general and to Shakespeare in particular. The conqueror and villain-hero plays of Elizabethan drama go back in the main to *Tamburlaine* and to *The Jew*. As to Shakespeare Dr. Boas cites *Richard II* and *The Merchant of Venice*, he makes no mention of *Richard III*, yet Marlowe is beyond all possible doubt the "only begetter" of that first great stage-success of the younger playwright. And from whom if not from Marlowe did Shakespeare learn to write dramatic blank-verse?

In spite of all the undoubted merits of this book it would seem that the final critical study of Marlowe the playwright rather than the man, placing him against the background of the stage and the drama of his day still remains to be written.

T. M. PARROTT

Lawrenceville, New Jersey

Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger. By BALDWIN MAXWELL. Chapel Hill University of North Carolina Press, 1939. Pp. x + 238. \$3 00.

In this attractive volume Professor Maxwell boldly attacks some of the numerous and vexing problems which confront the student of Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger. Of the seventeen essays, eight are here printed for the first time; the others have been revised and in several cases considerably enlarged since their first publication in learned journals. Many of the studies are concerned with the fundamental problem of dating the plays; in these, as elsewhere, Professor Maxwell identifies and evaluates topical allusions with commendable adroitness and discretion. In one series of studies, he finds evidence that Fletcher's attitude towards the code of the

duel underwent a change, and by tracing this he is enabled to postulate the order in which certain plays were written.

One of the most stimulating essays deals in part with the lists of actors included in the second Beaumont and Fletcher folio (1679). The source of these lists has always been a mystery. The publishers, Martyn, Herringman, and Marriot boast that the copy-text of this second folio was an extensively corrected first folio which they had purchased at a high price; the folio, they state, had been the property of an "ingenious and worthy Gentleman," whose "Corrections were the more to be valued, because he had an intimacy with both our Authors, and had been a Spectator of most of them when they were Acted in their life-time." Some critics have nominated for this honor the actor William Ecclestone (no gentleman, be it noted), whom Professor Maxwell does not positively reject, though he is skeptical, but a better candidate would, in my opinion, be the elder Charles Cotton. From the latter's kinsman, Sir Aston Cokayne, we learn (in 1658) that Cotton had been Fletcher's "friend and old Companion," and that he had been the original owner of the MS of *The Mad Lover*—once lent by him to Cokayne but later recalled—from which Moseley and Robinson printed the text of that play in the 1647 folio. Repeatedly Cokayne taxes Cotton for having permitted the printing in that folio of incorrect ascriptions of the plays of Fletcher, Beaumont, and Massinger.

But you may blame the Printers; yet you might
Perhaps have won them to do *Fletcher* right,
Would you have took the pains .

. . . I wish as free
Y'had told the Printers this, as you did me
Surely you was to blame

At the same time he addresses Moseley and Robinson thus :

But how came I (you ask) so much to know?
Fletcher's chief bosome-friend inform'd me so
Ith' next impression therefore justice do,
And print their old ones in one volume too
For *Beaumonts* works & *Fletcher's* should come forth
With all the right belonging to their worth

Moseley and Robinson were not destined to carry out this behest, but in 1679 Herringman and the others did so imperfectly. Meanwhile Cotton, as it seems to me, took Cokayne's importunities to heart, at least to the extent of correcting his personal copy of the first folio text and recording certain supplementary information. To sum up, Charles Cotton, "ingenious and worthy," and indubitably a gentleman, had been a friend of Fletcher's, a spectator at the early performances of his plays, an owner of dramatic manuscripts, and an intimate of the publishers of the first folio (1647). Alive as late as 1658 (according to Joseph Hunter), Cotton could better than anyone yet suggested have made in his folio the numerous MS

corrections, compiled the lists of actors (in the margin of the book, as Professor Maxwell shrewdly conjectures), and interpolated the "several Prologues and Epilogues, with the Songs appertaining to each Play, which were not in the former Edition, but are now inserted in their proper places."

JAMES G. McMANAWAY

The Folger Shakespeare Library

Religious Trends in English Poetry, Vol. I, 1700-1740: Protestantism and the Cult of Sentiment. By HOXIE NEALE FAIRCHILD. New York. Columbia University Press, 1939. Pp. xv + 612. \$5.00.

Mr. Fairchild's study of religious trends in English poetry between 1700 and 1740 is, as he tells us in his Preface, the first of a projected series of five volumes. Volume II is to deal with the period from 1740 to 1780, volumes III, IV, and V with, respectively, the romantic, Victorian, and contemporary eras.

Something should be said of Mr. Fairchild's methods in this first volume,—the same methods, presumably, are to be followed in the succeeding volumes. The discussion is based upon a body of pertinent verse gathered in accordance with definite principles. Of the 149 poets drawn upon, 118 fulfill a two-fold specification: all or the chief part of their work was done between 1700 and 1740, and their writings have been published in collected form. The remaining 31 poets fall within the period under discussion, but their works have never been, or are too slender to have been, collected. The result of this process of selection is a splendidly extensive body of verse illustrative, one would imagine, of practically all the varieties of religious—and semi- or pseudo-religious—expression in English poetry of the first four decades of the eighteenth century.

As a special collection of verse, then, Mr. Fairchild's book is admirable, and it will prove very useful to all students of the eighteenth century. It is with his commentary upon this material, with his historical interpretation of the period as a whole, that one must take exception. In his Preface Mr. Fairchild informs us, with charm and perfect candor, of his Anglo-Catholic convictions, and throughout his study he gives constant and emphatic expression to his religious philosophy. No one, I think, who is in any way qualified to discuss the eighteenth century will suggest that Mr. Fairchild's religious views have had anything to do with his misinterpretations of literary and cultural movements. For these faulty interpretations are due entirely to the greatly over-simplified theories of historical and literary development upon which Mr. Fairchild draws throughout the course of his commentary. The

verse presented in Volume I illustrates, he suggests, the continuous development of the Protestant spirit from puritanism to latitudinarianism to eighteenth-century sentimentalism; and sentimentalism is a pre-romantic phenomenon, pointing to the romanticism of the 1780-1830 period, which in turn may perhaps be regarded as "simply Protestant Christianity in a more or less delightfully phosphorescent state of decay."

Such is the central theory which emerges, and about which Mr Fairchild organizes his historical statement of the changing culture of the English Enlightenment. One begins, not so much by disavowing the theory itself, as by challenging the easy assumptions and the vastly over-simplified generalizations which lead up to the theory. By constantly affixing labels bearing such terms as *rationalism*, *latitudinarianism*, *primitivism*, *graveyardism*, *sentimentalism*, and *pre-romanticism* we can come perilously close to mere word-play. The historical truth about any period must be sought in the dramatic and enormously complex interplay of many forces. Is it enough, for instance, to indicate that sentimentalism usually produced verse with a warm and cheery outlook, that it was based on the assumption of man's innate goodness, that it remained silent regarding the Atonement? In response to what forces did it arise? What did it mean—emotionally, intellectually, socially, and economically—when entertained by individuals of different temperaments? And was it, in fact, "pre-romantic" at all? That is, would romanticism, had other factors not entered in, ever have followed chronologically upon sentimentalism? These questions are put, not in any systematic way, but merely to indicate the kind of over-simplified historical statement that is characteristic of the entire book.

RICARDO QUINTANA

The University of Wisconsin

The Life and Work of William Gilpin. By WILLIAM TEMPLEMAN.
Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1939. Pp
336. \$3.00.

Professor Templeman's book makes a substantial contribution as the first comprehensive study of the career of this "master of the picturesque," whose distinction in his own day embraced much more than the avocation for which he is now remembered. The "importance of Gilpin in developing and popularizing the conception of 'picturesque beauty'" receives the ample elucidation which the relation of that subject to the progress of eighteenth-century romanticism demands, but the chapters devoted to Gilpin's many years in the rôles of schoolmaster and country cleric constitute, because of their relative novelty, the most interesting portions

of the book. In both callings Gilpin achieved success which carried his reputation far beyond the precincts in which he worked. As head of Cheam School in Surrey he instituted a mode of religious instruction and a system of student government which evoked considerable attention. Of particular interest is Professor Templeman's plausible theory that Gilpin's disciplinary methods inspired the procedure by which the schoolmaster, Mr. Jennings, subdued the intractable Peregrine Pickle in Smollett's novel of that name. As Vicar of Boldre, in the diocese of Winchester, where he spent the last twenty-seven years of his life, Gilpin evinced in pastoral duties the same energy and resourcefulness which had distinguished him as a schoolmaster. He was instrumental in the founding at Lymington of a society "for the benefit of distressed females", he supervised the erection of a new poorhouse in Boldre, he set up two schools in Boldre, paying for them, and eventually endowing them, with money from the sale of his works on the picturesque. These philanthropic undertakings, first publicized in the *Reports of the Society for Bettering the Condition . . . of the Poor*, were repeatedly cited as exemplary and were emulated elsewhere. Similarly, certain of Gilpin's moral essays, printed originally for the edification of his humble parishioners, were broadcast by publication for the Cheap Repository for Religious and Moral Tracts.

Not all of the "new light" on Gilpin is confined to the biographical sections of the book. Professor Templeman makes positive the attribution, hitherto conjectural, of *A Dialogue upon the Gardens . . . at Stow* (1748), establishing it as "the first treatise in English setting forth critically . . . the beauty of landscape scenery as judged by a painter's eye," and its use of the word "picturesque" as the earliest in this special sense. Fresh evidence of the extent of Gilpin's reputation as a critic of prints and an expositor of the picturesque, especially on the continent, shows its penetration into remote and unexpected quarters. Into the details of the "paper war" over the propriety of the picturesque in landscape gardening the discussion does not enter, since Gilpin was not directly engaged, nevertheless, more concrete reminders of the points at issue among the controversialists would have helped in the record of the attention paid by them to Gilpin's work in the field. One may also venture to say that Professor Templeman's account would have gained, had he placed his chapters relative to the picturesque in sequence; not only would coherence in that quarter have been strengthened, but the narrative of Gilpin's professional life would have obtained unbroken continuity.

Professor Templeman is preparing an edition of unpublished letters, including many new ones on both sides of the correspondence between Gilpin and William Mason. This volume should prove most welcome and useful.

CHARLES J. HILL

Smith College

Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice Classicism in the Rhetoric and Poetic of Italy, France, and England 1400-1600. By CHARLES SEARS BALDWIN. Edited with introduction by DONALD LEMEN CLARK New York Columbia University Press, 1939. Pp. xiv + 251. \$2.75.

This posthumous volume is the third in the series of which *Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic* is the first and *Mediaeval Rhetoric and Poetic* the second. Chapters are as follows: I. The Renaissance as a Literary Period. II. Latin, Greek, and the Vernaculars. III. Imitation of Prose Forms, Ciceronianism, Rhetorics. IV. Imitation in Lyric and Pastoral. V. Romance. VI. Drama. VII. Sixteenth-Century Poetics. VIII. Prose Narrative. IX. Essays. Mr. Baldwin's plan was not wholly carried out, for example he intended to write on Castelvetro. This would perhaps have been one of the fullest and most appreciative portions of the work, for incidental references to that commentator on Aristotle are always laudatory. Doubtless other sections not mentioned by the editor were also contemplated. It hardly seems that Italian Renaissance tragedy, for example, would have been wholly unmentioned, and that Italian comedy, except for the pastoral and rustic, would have been almost equally neglected. From the preface and from comparison with the two earlier works, one infers that the parts now published were not destined for much further revision.

Seemingly Mr. Baldwin's method of study was the linear one, in which the scholar begins at the earliest stages of a subject and goes in order of time to the end. This method, so far as it can be carried through, has the advantage of giving some acquaintance with the whole subject. But obviously it yields in concentration and in opportunity for observing relationships to the cyclic method, in which the student moves in all directions from a center, visiting outlying topics for some reason suggested at the point of departure. Mr. Baldwin did, however, work with certain matters always in mind.

One of these is stated in the editor's preface as "the Aristotelian philosophy of composition embodied in the *Rhetoric* and the *Poetic*." To the present reviewer, a life-long student of the *Poetics*, Mr. Baldwin's Aristotelianism seems somewhat rigid, and perhaps the cause of his lack of enthusiasm for Ariosto and Spenser and his preference for Tasso,¹ both as poet and critic. Such an opinion is to be welcomed as opposed to the current view of Tasso as inferior, yet, great as are the *Jerusalem Delivered* and the *Discorsi del Poema Eroico*, they perhaps have less for the future than some of

¹ Tasso applies the words "falso in tutto" to the foundation of a belief held by Castelvetro, with whom Mr. Baldwin links him for praise

their companions in the sixteenth century. In general the literature and criticism of the Renaissance, as estimated by the author, suffer when brought into comparison with classical practice and theory.

A second important idea is that "rhetoric and poetic are different in aim" In Mr. Baldwin's opinion the Renaissance did not sufficiently realize this. True, it did not. Yet it is possible to ask whether the author has sufficiently developed the real similarities between oratory and poetry as the sixteenth century practised them, and whether objection to the rhetorical does not appear too often. But again Mr. Baldwin's work may serve as a salutary corrective to an attitude still common in literary criticism.

Duke University

ALLAN H. GILBERT

The Spirit of Molière, an Interpretation. By PERCY ADDISON CHAPMAN. Princeton · Princeton University Press, 1940. Pp. xxii + 250.

When Percy Chapman died, on Sept. 19, 1937, he left a MS. that he had intended to develop into a life of Molière and a study of his plays. This MS has been edited by M. Bédé, with some additions, of which the most extensive runs from p. 158 to p. 171. An introduction by Mr. Gauss indicates that Chapman "would have made it plain that *The Spirit of Molière* was not intended as a contribution to original research in literary history," but was "an attempt to throw light upon . . . the meaning of comedy, with particular reference to comedy as understood by Molière." This purpose is best shown in the final chapter, in which Chapman wisely criticizes Bergson's explanation of laughter when excited by comedy and defends Molière's picture of society, "in which character is shown as more important than station in the relations of men with each other." This last chapter suggests many questions that would doubtless have received further consideration had the author lived.

The rest of the book is fragmentary to an unfortunate degree. Molière's comedies through the *Ecole des femmes* are discussed in detail, but, except for a comparison between *Don Garcie* and *le Misanthrope* and references found in a discussion entitled "Molière and His Public," Chapman left very little about other plays. The manner in which the work was produced accounts not only for these deficiencies, but for certain slips that might easily have been corrected.¹ In spite of them the book constitutes an eloquent tribute to Molière and a fitting monument to one who loved his plays.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

¹ P. 63, in 1658 the playing of a farce after a tragedy had not been "abandoned in Paris for at least twenty-five years," nor should the *Roman*

The Tragedies of Herod and Mariamne. By MAURICE J. VALENCY.
New York. Columbia University Press, 1940. Pp. xiv + 308.

Maurice J. Valency has undertaken a task somewhat like that of R. H. Ball in *The Amazing Career of Sir Giles Overreach*. Mr. Ball studies the role of *Overreach* as a vehicle for acting throughout the centuries, Mr. Valency traces the various forms which dramatists have given to the story of Herod and Mariamne, from Hans Sachs in 1552 to Stephen Phillips in 1900. He lists thirty-seven Mariamne plays, and he accomplishes the heroic act of analyzing and grouping them. The best known of them all is Hebbel's *Herodes und Mariamne*, but Mr. Valency does not think highly of this tragedy "with its unnatural action, unreal characters, quixotic posturings, and, at the end, its utter confusion."

The chief difficulty in considering these plays is that no one of them is an unqualified success, and there is a certain dreariness in plowing through an account of so many literary failures. Mr. Valency remarks on the fact that Shakespeare created a masterpiece from much less promising material when he wrote *Othello*. The story of Herod and Mariamne is somewhat similar in outline but decidedly more intricate in detail. As told by Josephus, it presents Mariamne sympathetically and describes Herod as terrible and at the same time pathetic. Under varying influences, he later assumes the character of a Wrathful King, a Senecan Tyrant, a Vacillating Lover, or a Jealous Husband. No one of the literary treatments of Herod pictures him as well as the historian Josephus in the role of a Deluded Human Being.

Mr. Valency divides the Mariamne plays into three groups, depending on the attitude of Mariamne towards Herod: she loves him throughout, she does not care for him at all, or she loves him only at first. In the last case there is the best opportunity for psychological analysis, but the resulting increase in the importance of Mariamne detracts from the central position of Herod in the dramatic structure. It is absorbingly interesting to observe the innumerable variations that have been rung upon this complicated theme, it is somewhat depressing to see what little success has been achieved by the dramatists of the ages in treating material that seems eminently fitted for the stage.

comique be dated "1657" P 66, so far as is known, *Sanche Pansa* was not written in 1635 P 69, last quotation, for "enfouie" read "enfouée" P. 96, the presence of spectators on either side of the stage cannot be called "perhaps the most important single factor determining the character of French classical comedy and tragedy" for the reason that, so far as has been determined, it was exceptional for spectators to sit there before the middle of the century P 217, what evidence is there that "neither magistrates, lawyers, nor doctors went to the theater"? P 225, to refer to Molière's "attack on religion" is certainly misleading

In the "Epilogue" Mr. Valency sketches his idea of how the story might best be handled. Throughout the course of his book he does all that he can—and perhaps more than he should—to enliven the subject by such characteristic sentences as, "It may be observed that in general Massinger's plays suffer from fifth-act trouble," "Calderón's plays make the impression of having interchangeable parts," and "The ghosts banished from the French stage after Hardy became *émigrés*, and went to join their confreres in Germany and England, where the Mariamne plays were numbered among their favorite haunts." The serious value of Mr. Valency's work does not need such gaudy adornment.

University of Buffalo

HENRY TEN EYCK PERRY

Geschichtsdrama und nationaler Mythos Grenzfragen zur Gegenwartsform des Dramas By JULIUS PETERSEN. Stuttgart. J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1940. Pp. 61.

The present work of Professor Julius Petersen is somewhat analogous to his recent brochure *Die Sehnsucht nach dem Dritten Reich in deutscher Sage und Dichtung*. Both works deal with phenomena that have come to the fore particularly under Hitler's regime and in both the author points out and analyses earlier appearances of the same ideas. The fact that this booklet is dated 1940 and dedicated to "Meinen Horern im Felde" throws some additional light on its general tenor. The theme, stated broadly, is the origin and development of the historical drama, chiefly from Lessing down to the authors of the *dritte Reich*.

Professor Petersen begins by discussing the debate concerning the freedom of the dramatist vis-à-vis historical material which has been going on since Lessing's day. The latter states in *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* (19. Stuck), a passage to which our author refers in his first note "Die Absicht der Tragodie ist weit philosophischer als die Absicht der Geschichte, und es heiszt sie von ihrer wahren Würde herabsetzen, wenn man sie zu einem blossen Panegyrikus berühmter Manner macht, oder sie gar den Nationalstolz zu nahren miszbraucht." Regarding the author's freedom of treatment, Schiller's conception was to take only the general situation and the characters from history "und alles Ubrige poetisch frei zu erfinden" (p. 17). Goethe's views were very similar. In *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* Kleist created "das herrlichste vaterlandische Drama, dessen Wirkung eigentlich darin begründet ist, dasz es kein Geschichtsdrama im strengsten Sinne sein wollte" (p. 22). The Romanticists in the following decades demanded the closest adherence to history; Georg Buchner, for example, employed word

for word the actual speeches of Robespierre or Danton (p. 25). For Hebbel, history was only a vehicle "zur Verkörperung seiner eigener Anschauungen und Ideen" (p. 27). Thus the author has no difficulty in showing that there exists no unified notion of what constitutes the substance of historical drama. The same holds true regarding the language as well as the stage presentation of such plays (chapters VI and VII).

Professor Petersen's study was motivated by the official encouragement on the part of the present government of historical drama and the form the latter now is taking. Thus he cites Erich von Hartz, who demands a theatre in which "die Kampfkraft der Nation ihren Sinn starkt und steigert" (p. 47). This is to be a "Kulttheater," different not only in spirit but also in form from the conventional playhouse, *e. g.* use of chorus, open-air setting, etc. Such notions are by no means new. Klopstock wished to have his patriotic drama *Heimannsschlacht* played in a particular outdoor setting before battalions of Prussian troops (p. 19). Keller in an essay entitled *Am Mythenstein* envisioned a vast theatre, perhaps at the *Vierwaldstättersee*, for the purpose of marking patriotic folk-festivals (p. 39). Toward the end of the nineteenth century a new type of theatre was erected in Worms for Luther and Gustav Adolf dramas (p. 42), and of course there was Bayreuth, not to mention numerous other similar endeavors. Most of them had the definite aim of presenting heroic figures or legends for the benefit of "the people."

Professor Petersen's historic presentation is very interesting for the student of drama, but of even greater interest to his German readers probably is the good advice which this sound literary critic gives regarding the current patriotic plays, of which he analyses quite a number. He warns the authors that lack of conflict or of worthy antagonists to the hero destroys tragedy and dramatic tension; that myths are most effective on the stage when their general contour has already been formed in the popular mind, not when they are freshly created by the playwright. Moreover he makes a plea for the toleration of every form of theatre rather than the development of a current fad.

A. E. ZUCKER

The University of Maryland

Hebbels Menschengestaltung als dichterischer Ausdruck nordisch-deutschen Wesens. Von FRANZ BIELFELDT. (Germanische Studien, Heft 209.) Berlin · Emil Ebering, 1939.

Obschon diese Abhandlung in einer wissenschaftlichen Serie erscheint, ist sie so voll von ideologischen Entstellungen und gehässigen Angriffen auf eine verdienstvolle und ehrliche For-

schung, dasz man sich fragt, wie die Herausgeber ein solches Pamphlet zum Druck zulassen konnten. Die bisherige Hebbelforschung wird von dem Verfasser kaum berücksichtigt, dafür propagandistische Schriften des Nationalsozialismus um so reichlicher herangezogen. Holofernes wird zum rassebewussten Herrenmenschen umgedeutet, und Judith wird zu einer Zwittergestalt jüdischer Verschlagenheit und germanischer Heldenkraft. *Genoveva* wird als Verirrung des Dichters von der Untersuchung ausgeschlossen, da die Heldin eine christliche Heilige mit den nichtnordischen Tugenden der Demut und Barmherzigkeit ist. In *Maria Magdalene* wird Meister Anton zum Haupthelden wegen seines unbedingten Ehrgefühls. Die Schuld an der Vernichtung Klaras trägt nicht etwa seine enge, angstliche Unterordnung unter die öffentliche Meinung, sondern der "westeuropäische Liberalismus jüdischer Prägung" (in der Literaturgeschichte besser unter dem Namen Jungdeutschland bekannt). Dieser ausländische Einfluss wird für Klaras "undeutsche Persönlichkeitsentauszerung" verantwortlich gemacht. Mit gleicher Urteilslosigkeit und Oberflächlichkeit wird Karl sittlich höher gewertet als der Sekretar *Herodes und Marianne* wird offensichtlich wegen der Schwierigkeit, eine zweite jüdische Heldin mit "typisch germanischen" Zügen vorzuführen, mit grosser Kuhnheit, jedoch mit geringer Überzeugungskraft als minder bedeutende Vorstufe für *Gyges und sein Ring* nur vergleichsweise erwähnt! Die Interpretation der *Agnes Bernauer* stellt sich natürlich in einseitiger Weise auf den Boden der Staatsautorität, die der Hebbelschen Dialektik nicht gerecht werden kann. Völlig verfehlt ist die Interpretation von *Gyges und sein Ring*. Die dialektische Gestaltung der Charaktere wird von dem Verfasser überhaupt nicht erkannt. Sie sind ihm vielmehr Repräsentanten unüberbrückbarer volkhafter Gegensätze und—in mir undurchsichtiger Logik—zugleich Repräsentanten nordischen Menschentums! Die *Nibelungen*-Trilogie, das unselbständigste Werk Hebbels, wird zum Höhepunkt seines Schaffens, da es die rassenseelisch bedingte Feindschaft zwischen Germanentum und Christentum darstellt. Die historische Synthese, die zum Charakteristischsten des Hebbelschen Dramas gehört, wird entweder nicht berücksichtigt oder als Theaterkonzession beiseite geschoben. Das einzige Verdienst, das ich in dieser Abhandlung sehen kann, ist, dasz es als abschreckendes Beispiel für die Vermischung von politischer Ideologie und literarischer Betrachtung zu dienen vermag.

F. W. KAUFMANN

Oberlin College

Translations from the Poetry of Rainer Maria Rilke. By M. D. HERTER NORTON. New York: W. W. Norton and Co. \$2.50.

Rainer Maria Rilke. Duino Elegies. The German Text, with an English Translation, Introduction and Commentary by J. B. LEISHMAN and STEPHEN SPENDER. New York: W. W. Norton and Co. Pp. 130. \$2.00.

The two volumes represent a most welcome contribution to Rilke literature in English speaking countries, the one probably the best introduction to those who know little or nothing about him, the other a translation and commentary of that work which even the initiated cannot just read and understand but must conquer through hard interpretative work. Both books print the original and the rendering on opposite pages, but their approach and technique are quite different.

Mrs. Norton, experienced translator and editor of Rilke with several of his works to her credit, gives in her terse foreword a convincing account of her reasons for not attempting to imitate closely, in meter and rhyme, the form of the poet. Two languages, she argues, do not function alike in expressing ideas through images, symbols, color, sound, quality of words, rhythm and rhyme. The principal factor to convey, however, is the idea and to deviate from the original at any convenient point—omitting words or stretching the verse, changing rhyme schemes etc. as the translator invariably does—will not accomplish the purpose. For word values and qualities, however, equivalents may be found, and with a never failing taste she aims at the closest idiomatic parallel, at the noble simplicity of Rilke's diction in her somewhat rhythmical prose renderings.

A judicious selection and ten pages of notes characterize the collections from which the poems are taken and give dates and occasional hints for a better understanding. Some difficulties are insuperable, for instance, the line "um ihn, der wie ein Weiser sich beschließt," in which *beschließt* functions in two meanings, *resolve* and *close his life*, "like a sage resolved to his end" is only an approximation, but one which is a strikingly happy find even though it substitutes two words for one. One need only compare Mrs. Norton's translation of *Verkündigung* with another extant version to recognize the wisdom of her procedure:

Ich spannte meine Schwingen aus
Und wurde seltsam weit;
jetzt überfließt dein kleines Haus
von meinem großen Kleid

I spread my wings apart, and straight
strangely, had distant grown,
now overflows thy little house
with my great billowing gown

I spread my wings out and became
wonderfully wide;
now my small house overflows
with my great dress.

The form of the *Dunno Elegies*, that strange rhymeless dactylic meter of unequal verse length, is easier to imitate and is, therefore, kept in the second book. But there are other difficulties to overcome which are not always mastered, the concentration of several meanings in one word and the solemn, yet simple and sometimes almost conversational expression. Of the first I mention "Wo willst du sie bergen," for which *conceal* is hardly the right equivalent, for it does not contain the tender and protective gesture. The second characteristic misleads the translators through an abuse of the apostrophe into difficulties for eye and ear: "one's gently weaned" or "hostility's our first response" or "all that here/they're for ever unable to manage" is impossible to grasp when heard. Nor is Rilke's "Was soll's" adequately rendered by "What's the use." "Er wird staunender stehn" would in tempo and also in rhythm rather demand the full form of the auxiliary instead of "he'll stand more astonished." In the case of "can't impress him" the English a-pronunciation may make a preference for "cannot" debatable.

But such blemishes should not blind us to the tremendous task that has been performed here in the collaboration of Messrs. Spender and Leishman. The introduction and notes, furnished by the latter, give most valuable help for the understanding, especially through an explanation of symbols by means of parallel passages, quotations from letters, occasional borrowings from other commentators, and four appendices, of which *Rilke's Mystic Experiences* and the *Task of Transformation* are indispensable.

ERNST FEISE

BRIEF MENTION

Oliver Wendell Holmes: Representative Selections, with Introduction, Bibliography, and Notes by S. I. HAYAKAWA and HOWARD MUMFORD JONES. Edited by Harry Hayden Clark. New York, etc.: American Book Company, 1939. Pp. cxxx + 472. (American Writers Series) *John Lothrop Motley: Representative Selections*, with Introduction, Bibliography, and Notes by CHESTER PENN HIGBY and B. T. SCHANTZ. Pp. clxii + 482. [Same.] The students of American literature for whom these volumes are designed will find in the Selections they contain and in their Bibliographies two excellent avenues of approach: the first, through a judicious choice of specimens, to the writings of Holmes and Motley; the second, to everything that has been written about them. The Introductions and the Notes raise questions to which it would be interesting to receive answers from the very students for whom

the books are planned. Do they, for instance, need to know all that the ample footnotes will tell them about Holmes's fellow-students and medical instructors in Paris? Is a beginner with Motley profited at all by finding beneath a mention of Motley's less obvious sources, authors about whom "little information is to be found in the usual works of reference," a footnote giving a list of eighteen standard encyclopedias in French, Dutch, German, Italian, Spanish, and English? Noting the places and dates of publication and the number of volumes in each of these works may have been a profitable exercise of Ph. D. muscles, but why challenge a neophyte to start in quite so many directions in which "little information is to be found"? Are footnotes of this nature really anything more than exhibits of graduate school "methodology"?

The writers of theses are expected to omit nothing that is germane to their subjects, and the text of the Introductions to these volumes covers fully, in more than a hundred pages each, the backgrounds, personalities, aims, and achievements of Holmes and Motley, both as writers and, respectively, as medical scholar and diplomat. Unfortunately these pages, containing excellent passages, have not all received the meticulous care which appears to have been devoted to the annotations. Even in these it seems a pity to deprive the name of John T. Morse, Jr. of that suffix of youth which he carried so jauntily for more than ninety years, and to modernize an early James Winthrop into James W. Winthrop. Both of these instances are drawn from the Holmes volume. In that also the Introduction shows signs of a haste that should be alien to a book produced by two professors under the supervision of a third. Dr. Johnson's Lichfield, for example, takes on the Connecticut spelling of Litchfield. Samuel Gridley Howe assumes the complete disguise of Rufus Gridley Howe. Charles Sumner is named among the radicals unmentioned by George Ticknor in his memoirs, although the index to those volumes gives three page references to his name. "The old '*Odi ignobile vulgus*' of Horace" is tossed off with a familiarity which really should not have substituted *ignobile* for *profanum*.

In many respects these volumes fulfil their purpose admirably. It is only a pity that the exacting standards of scholarship over-displayed on some pages seem to have been ignored on others.

M. A. DE WOLFE HOWE

Boston

Historische deutsche Grammatik, 1. Band *Geschichtliche Einleitung, Lautlehre*. Von CARL KARSTIEN. Heidelberg Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1939. Pp. xlv + 200 (Germanische Bibliothek). During the last few years we have been presented with several books on the history and development of the German lan-

guage, but they have approached the subject from different angles or emphasized particular aspects of it. The present book is, as stated in the 'Vorwort,' 'ein Buch für die Studierenden,' which attempts to replace or rather supplement the older method of simply learning the various Germanic languages as independent of each other by a 'Verbindung der von den Grammatikern gelehrten Normalsprachformen der Perioden untereinander.' In this the author has succeeded very well. He always, whenever possible, keeps the development of the modern 'Schriftsprache' before the student. After a comprehensive 'Literaturverzeichnis' covering the Indo-European languages as well as the various Germanic dialects the author launches into an historic account of the development of the present German literary language. The main part of the book is then taken up with a clear and sane discussion of the vowels and consonants as they develop from Indo-European to modern German with due consideration of the German dialects and their influence on the literary language. The book is an excellent guide for the student of the German language. The cases in which one might differ with the author are for the most part moot questions, as for example, the reviewer is absolutely convinced that the form *gá-skaft* (v. pp. 46-47) with the accent on the *a* (*gá-*) is a scribal error and cannot be used to support the view of prefixal accentuation. The following errors were noted: p. 18, line 6 from top read *dazu* for *zu da*, p. 89, line 3 the reference *S* 182 *Ann.* 2 is wrong, p. 107, line 6-7 read *Aspiratae*; p. 108, line 13 read *aspiratae*; p. 115, line 24 read *Armenischen und*, p. 123, line 32 read *Stammen* for *Stimmen*, p. 128, line 28 read *norddeutscher*, p. 159, line 14 read 'wir helfen.'

EDWARD H. SEHRT

George Washington University

A Voyage to Cacklogallina. By CAPTAIN SAMUEL BRUNT. Reproduced from the original edition, 1727, with an Introduction by MARJORIE NICOLSON. Facsimile Text Society. Columbia University Press, 1940. Pp. xv + 167. In this pseudonymous *Voyage*, which appeared a year after *Gulliver's Travels*, the Cacklogallinians hold an unfavorable estimate of their shipwrecked English guest which at several points suggests the Houyhnhnms. Otherwise, the resemblances to Swift's masterpiece are negligible. The greater interest is in 'Captain Brunt' as hero of another fantastic trip to the moon in the tradition of Ariosto, Godwin, Cyrano, and Defoe. The distinctive features of the *Voyage to Cacklogallina* are (1) the regard for scientific credibility in dealing with lunar travel, including an air of probability which even Defoe did not achieve in his *Consolidator*, 1705, and (2) the relevance of the topical satire to our own times, especially the ridicule of wild-cat finance, and the

company organized to fetch gold from the moon, better known as the South Sea Bubble.

Two-thirds of the narrative are occupied with the traveller's misadventures among the oversized fowl of Cacklogallina, whose feathered citizens vary in size with their self-importance, and whose Court is subject to the petticoat government of the hen-pecking Squabbaws. In the orthodox Cyrano tradition, the natives regard the traveller as an irrational monkey. Occasional touches of satire are effective: patriots are eager to die for their emperor, and vie with each other for the honor of being served up at his state dinners. Taxes for ham-and-egg benefits include at least one that is worthy of our own time: "The Tax which he approved of most, was on the Light of the Sun, according to the Hours it was enjoy'd; so that the poor Peasant, who rose with it, paid for Twelve Hours Day-light, and the Nobility and Gentry, who kept their Beds till Noon, paid only for Six" (p. 108).

The best review is the Introduction by Miss Nicolson. The editor is much more readable than the author and is more successful in rendering his meaning. I wish the Facsimile Text Society would do us the further service to reproduce other and more valuable satires which followed in the wake of the ship of Lemuel Gulliver, notably *Memoirs of the Court of Lilliput, 1727*, and *The Travels of Mr. John Gulliver, Son to Capt. Lemuel Gulliver, 1731*,—a translation from the French of the Abbé Desfontaines. A library of collected *Gulliveriana* would be instructive reading and good entertainment.

WILLIAM ALFRED EDDY

Hobart College

Keats. By H. W. GARROD. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1939 (2nd edition) Pp. 155 \$2 00. In 1926 Mr Garrod first published this expansion of lectures delivered by him during the preceding year as Professor of Poetry at Oxford. In the present re-issue the contents remain substantially unchanged; the marking off of subdivisions accentuates the original effect of disunity. Predominantly in the opening pages and intermittently thereafter Mr. Garrod is concerned with evaluating other writers' work on his subject; his strictures on Miss Lowell are unmodified, and the innuendoes persist. What—one may well inquire—what has the "dollar-value" of Miss Lowell's documents, what has "her other-wise democratic spirit," or the problematical existence of her grandfather, to do with the soundness of her scholarship and criticism today? It is when he turns his attention to the nature of Keats's individual talent that Mr. Garrod is most persuasive. He still believes Keats to be "the great poet he is only when the senses capture him, when he finds truth in beauty, that is to say, when he

does not trouble to find truth at all" This position, though not as original as Mr. Garrod insists, is effectively re-argued. The analysis of the meaning of the Great Odes (VI), and of Keats's debt to Coleridge (VII), should be perennially helpful to students of the poet Mr. Garrod's third aim—a technical analysis of Keats's odes and sonnets—is one that cannot be achieved without that very "rigorous . . . method of scholarship" which he himself has demanded. The first edition of his *Keats* did not satisfy this ideal, and although he has now "corrected some errors in the text," there remain examples of faulty method and misstated fact which were pointed out ten years ago. The note on the sonnet has been buttressed by the use of newly discovered materials for dating, and by a brief section on sonnets in the Shakespearian pattern On the other hand, the omission of the date "1816" from its place in the table of Petrarchian sonnets adds to the obscurity of the conclusions based upon that table. Throughout the entire book passages of careless and ungrammatical writing hamper the reader, and sound a somewhat ironic overtone to the author's plea for "genuine mental industry" and "braced imagination". It is obvious that Mr. Garrod has thought hard about Keats, but not until his own standards are applied more rigidly to his own book will it become apparent that his thought is consistently straight or clear or relevant.

NELSON S. BUSHNELL

Williams College

Aeneae Silvii de Liberorum Educatione, a Translation, with an Introduction. By Brother JOEL STANISLAUS NELSON, F.S.C. Studies in Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Language and Literature, of the Catholic University of America, Vol. XII, Washington, 1940. Pp. xii + 231. This work consists of text, notes on the sources, translation, introduction, bibliography, and three indices, one to the introduction, an *index locorum* quoted by Aeneas, and an *index nominum*. The text had hitherto been accessible in modern form only in the *Fontes rerum Austriacarum*, LXVIII. The longest part of the introduction deals with the educational theory of Aeneas in comparison with other writers, for example Vincent of Beauvais and Egidio Colonna For the former's *De eruditione filiorum nobilium* the author was able to use the recent admirable edition by Professor Arpad Steiner. For Egidio's *De regimine principum* he seems to have relied on the Old French translation edited by S. P. Molenaer. It would seem that some form of the original Latin might have been used, for there are many copies in America. A modern edition of Egidio's work is a desideratum, and would be appropriate for the Studies in Mediaeval Latin of the Catholic University. Brother Joel's work in identifying Aeneas'

sources is much to be commended. The translation of p. 205, lines 7-8, perhaps could be improved. While no systematic comparison of the translation as a whole has been made, it seems generally adequate, and surely is convenient for students of renaissance education.

Duke University

ALLAN H. GILBERT

Der junge Eichendorff und Novalis' Naturpantheismus. By Dr. AMALIE WEIHE. (= Germanistische Studien, Heft 210) Berlin Emil Ebering, 1939. Pp 96. Diese Dissertation dupliziert zum Teil meinen Aufsatz über Eichendorffs *Marmorbild* (Germanic Revue, April 1936) bis in Einzelheiten und mit denselben Schlüssen. Man ist in Deutschland leider noch immer nicht auf den Gedanken gekommen, daß in amerikanischen Fachschriften auch einmal ein Kornchen gefunden werden konnte, sonst hätte der Verfasserin manche Muhe erspart werden können. Allerdings erweitert sich dann die Untersuchung über meine Analyse hinaus und zeigt, wie stark Eichendorff in den Jugendgedichten von Novalis beeinflusst ist, wie er sich vom Naturpantheismus abwendet zu einer katholisch-christlichen Gottesauffassung, wie diese Wendung gespiegelt wird in der Romana-episode von *Ahnung und Gegenwart* und endlich zur Reife kommt im *Marmorbild*. So rundet und fundiert sie die Problemstellung und lost sie in einer klaren, abschließenden und ausgewogenen Betrachtung, der wir zu Danke verpflichtet sind.

E. FEISE

CORRESPONDENCE

CHAUCER'S MONK AGAIN "Chaucer's Monk" (J S P. Tatlock, *MLN*, May, 1940) alleges that Abbot Cloune of Leicester is claimed to be the Monk in my paper entitled "A governour wily and wys" (*MLN*, November, 1939). The thesis of "Chaucer's Monk," that the Monk's house is Westminster abbey, is offered in correction of this alleged claim. But no such claim is made, my paper is not concerned with the problem of the Monk's identity except to state in the final summary paragraph that present knowledge is inadequate for any consideration of this problem in respect to Cloune, and of course there is no attempt to deduce from Cloune's history and character any facts concerning the Monk, either as to his own identity or that of his house, his order or his rank, his pin or the date of the *Canterbury Tales*, or any other matter, as "Chaucer's Monk" might lead one to suppose. This misrepresentation is implied throughout "Chaucer's Monk" and all comment on my paper is distorted by it. It seems to be due to misapprehension as to such technical matters as the

suspended judgment, the exegesis as distinguished from the argument for a thesis, the direct statement sincerely propounded from sources minutely shown, the omission of citation where a statement of fact, such as the fact that the Augustinian canons were monks, is verifiable in any standard work of reference on the subject (cf. "no medieval would use Monk of an Augustinian canon," "Chaucer's Monk," p. 351), and the distinction between primary and secondary sources where a chronicle text is collated with its sources (cf. the erroneous statement, "Most of her information about de Cloune comes from Knighton's chronicle," *ibid.*, p. 354). Further, there is no development of the thesis that the Monk's house is Westminster abbey e.g., the statement that the Monk is prior of his house, for which no evidence is adduced, or, the unsubstantiated allegation that the line, *As fer as sowneth into honestee, Canterbury Tales*, B 3157, means "so far as makes for decency" in reference to the Host's leering derision, and proves the peculiar circumstances under which the Monk "would be sure" to choose to tell the story of the patron saint of his house in defense of his own dignity. And there is no attempt to clear away manifest difficulties, for example, the difficulty that the Monk lived out of cloister and was keeper of the cell, while the Benedictines, so far as is known, enforced living in cloister,—unlike the Augustinians who notoriously occupied the monastery manors and granges as country-residences which were colloquially known as cells, while the monk in charge was called *custos* or keeper. Consequently, it may not be assumed but must be proved that the prior of Westminster abbey, or of any other Benedictine house, lived out of cloister and was keeper of a cell. Westminster abbey is not known to have had any cells that were not regularly constituted priories, so that if the Monk were "prelate" of one of them,—of Great Malverne which was founded by the Confessor, or of Hurley, or Sudbury,—his house would be his own priory, not Westminster abbey, and, residing in his cell as his duty required, he could not be regarded as living out of cloister.

RAMONA BRESSIE

Chicago

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received]

Bradner, Leicester. — *Musae Anglicanae* a history of Anglo-Latin poetry, 1500-1925. *New York*: Mod. Lang. Ass'n. of America, 1940. Pp. xii + 383. \$3.50 (Mod. Lang. Ass'n of America, General Series, X)

Craig, Horace S. — Dueling scenes and terms in Shakespeare's plays *Los Angeles, Calif*: U. of Calif Press, 1940. Pp. iv + 28 \$0.25. (U. of Calif Pubs in Eng, vol 9, 1.)

Greg, W. W. — The variants in the first quarto of "King Lear" *London*: Oxford U Press, 1940 Pp vii + 192. (Supplement to the Bibliographical Society's Transactions, 15)

Havens Volume of ELH, The. Articles by friends and students of R D Havens (*ELH*, Vol. VII) *Baltimore*. Johns Hopkins Press, 1940 x + 362 pp \$3 00

Jonas, Leah. — The divine science, the aesthetic of some representative seventeenth-century English poets. *New York*: Columbia U Press, 1940. Pp. xii + 292 \$3 00 (Columbia U. Studies in Eng and Comp. Lit, 151.)

Moffet, Thomas. — *Nobilis*, or a view of the life and death of a Sidney, and *Lessus Lugubris*. With introduction, translation, and notes by Virgil B. Heltzel and Hoyt H. Hudson *San Marino, Calif.*: Huntington Library, 1940. Pp. xxiv + 146 \$3 75

Shafer, Robert. — From Beowulf to Thomas Hardy, new edition with period introductions. I *New York*: Doubleday, Doran, [1939]. II *New York*: Odyssey Press, [1940] Pp xii + 1072 Pp xiv + 1100 \$6 00

GERMAN

Allmers, Hermann. — Briefe von Hermann Allmers und Briefe aus seinem Freundeskreis. Auf Veranlassung der Hermann Allmers-Ges hrsg von Kurd Schulz. [Abhandlungen und Vorträge, Hrsg. von d. Bremer wissenschaftl Ges. Bd 12, H. 3 = Schriften der Bremer wissenschaftl. Ges. Reihe D]. *Bremen*: Geist, 1939. 76 pp. M. 3.

Bericht über die Sitzungen des Philologischen Vereins zu Berlin 1938/39. Den Mitglhedern zum 70. Stiftungsfeste überreicht. *Berlin*: Weidmann, 1939. 14 pp. 40 Pf.

Christmann, Ernst. — Volkssprache. Ihr Wesen u ihr Werden, dargestellt am Beispiel der Mundart in Saar-Pfalz. *Neustadt*: Westmark-Verl. 1938 59 pp. M. 2.80.

Collins, Ralph Stokes. — The Artist in Modern German Drama. Johns Hopkins Diss. *Baltimore, Md* · 1940 135 pp

Deimann, Wilhelm. — Hermann Lons. Ein soldatisches Vermächtnis Mit einem Vorwort von Friedhelm Kaiser, einem Löns-Bildnis von Ernst v Dombrowski, der Singweise des Matrosenliedes von Herms Niel u. 8 Seiten [Faksimiles] aus Lons' Kriegstagebuch [*Berlin*.] Ahnenerbe-Stiftung Verl. [1939] 72 pp M. 1 60

Esche, Annelinde. — Elise Rudiger geb. von Hohenhausen Ein Bild ihres Lebens u. Schaffens. Diss Munster. *Emsdetten, Westf.*: Lechte, 1939 72 pp.

Janda, Otto. — Die Literatur der Steiermark im Mittelalter Vortrag. [Vorabdr. aus: Zentralblatt f Bibliothekswesen, Jg 56 = Arbeiten aus d steiermarkischen Landesbibl am Johanneum in Graz, H 4] *Graz*. Landesbibliothek, 1939 8 pp.

Karell, Victor. — Goethe als Karlsbader Kurgast [Veröffentlichungen des stadt. Kulturamtes, Karlsbad. Folge 1] *Leipzig*: Hennisch Verl. 1939. 63 pp. 5 plates, 1 facsimile. M. 2.50.

Lohse, Gerhart. — Geschichte der Ortsnamen im ostlichen Friesland zwischen Weser und Ems. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Landeskunde der deutschen Nordseeküste [Oldenburger Forschungen H. 5]. *Oldenburg* Gerh. Stalling, 1939 223 pp, 1 plate M. 4 50

Naumann, Hans, u. Betz, Werner. — Althochdeutsches Elementarbuch Grammatik und Texte [Sammlung Götschen 1111] *Berlin*. de Gruyter, 1937 133 pp M. 1 62.

Oefftering, Wilh. E. — Geschichte der Literatur in Baden T 3 Bis zur Gegenwart. [Heimatblätter "Vom Bodensee zum Main." Nr 47] *Karlsruhe*: C. F. Müller [1939]. 207 pp. M. 3 90

Patzold, Alfred. — Verzeichnis und Deutung der deutschen Vornamen [Familienkundliche Hefte f d Niederlausitz 10] *Cottbus*: H. Striemann, 1939 39 pp 75 Pf.

Ronkens, Win. — Wort- und Sachgeographie Sudost-Niederlands und der umliegenden Gebiete Mit bes Berücksichtigung des Volkskundlichen T 1A 1B *Nymegen*: Uitgevers Mij "De Gelderland", 1937 xi, 487 pp, 8°, Atlas, 7, 90, 10 plates, 4°. Fl 18

Schmeding, Heinrich. — Die Mundart des Kirchspiels Lavellosh und der angrenzenden Ortschaften Diss Munster. [Schriften d. volkskundlichen Kommission im Provinzialinstitut für westf. Landes- u Volkskunde. H 1]. *Munster*: Aschendorff [1938]. vi, 118 pp M. 4 50.

Schroder, Edward. — Aus den Anfängen des deutschen Buchtitels [Nachrichten von der Ges der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philol.-hist. Kl Fachgr. 4, N. F Bd 2, Nr 1]. *Göttingen*: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939 11 pp.

tingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1937. 48 pp. M 3

Troeb, Karl. — Arztsoldat und Dichter Zum Schaffen Gustav Sondermanns. *Berlin*: Wichern-Verl [1939] 27 pp 40 Pf.

Uhlmann-Bixterheide, Wilhelm. — Ein bibliographisches Verzeichnis seiner Veröffentlichungen 1891-1936 [Bearb von Toni Klein] *Dortmund*: Stadt- u Landesbibl [1939]. 26 pp

Vasmer, Max. — Bausteine zur Geschichte der deutsch-slavisches geistigen Beziehungen I [Aus Abhandl d Preuss. Akad d Wiss, Phil-hist Kl Jg 1938, Nr. 6] *Berlin*: de Gruyter, 1939 xlv, 168 pp. 4^o M 13

Weigand, Wilhelm. — Welt und Weg. Aus meinem Leben *Bonn* Rohrscheid [1940] 401 pp. M 630

FRENCH

Barbey d'Aureville. — Les Diaboliques, éd. Léon Gosset *Paris*: Mercure de France, 1939 331 pp Fr. 18

Benoît de Sainte Maure. Dal Roman de Troie *Pisa*: Curtatone e Montanara, 1939 58 pp

Chini, M. — F. Mistral. *Milan*: Bietti, 1939. 91 pp.

Comte de Portiers, Roman du, poème fr du XII^es, éd Bertil Malmberg. *Lund*: Gleerup, 1940. 210 pp. (Études romanes de Lund, 1.)

Emery, L. — Vision et pensée chez V Hugo. *Lyons*: Audin, 1939. 136 pp.

Kemp, Fr. — Baudelaire u das Christentum Munich diss., 1939. 143 pp

Lemaître, G. E. — André Maurois. *Stanford U*: S. U. Press, 1939. ix + 128 pp.

Meyer, Margrit. — Die Unruhe Vignys u. die Mittel zur Erlangung des Gleichgewichts Zurich diss., 1939 118 pp

Pernicone, V. — I romanzi francesi dell'epoca classica nel sec. XII con particolare riguardo al Roman de Troie de Benoît de Sainte Maure. *Pisa*: Curtatone e Montanara, 1939 135 pp.

Portalupi, M. — F. Ozanam. *Rome*: Pia Soc San Paolo, 1939 189 pp.

Spurlin, Paul M. — Montesquieu in America, 1760-1801 *University, La.*: La State U. Press, 1940. xii + 302 pp. \$3.00.

Verlaine, P. — Sagesse. Liturgies intime. Ed. Le Dantec *Paris*: Eds de Cluny, 1939. 219 pp Fr. 15.

Wegener, Luise. — Die Darstellung der Frau in den Dramen von P. Hervieu. Munster diss., 1938 66 pp.

Zahn, L. — Eine Frau kämpft gegen Napoleon Das Leben der Mme de Staël. *Berlin*: Kiepenhauer, 1939. 320 pp.

ITALIAN

Annuario del teatro italiano. Anno IV. Pref. di G. M. Sangiorgi. *Roma*: Soc ital. autori ed editori, 1939 vii + 661 pp

Belli, G. G. — Sonetti Ed G. Vigolo Vol. I e II. *Milano*: Bietti, 1939 xii + 273; 313 pp

Cavazzuti, G. — L. A. Muratori. 1672-1750. *Torino*: Paravia, 1939. 122 pp.

Cioffari, V., and Van Horne, J. (eds.). — Racconti A Graded Italian Reader Book Two *Boston* Heath, 1940. 58 pp

Deledda, Grazia. — Marianna Sirca Edited with Introduction, Notes and Vocabulary by M. B. Jones and A. T. Bissiri. *Boston*: Heath, 1940 185 pp

Masuccio Salernitano. Il novellino. A cura di Alfredo Mauro *Bar*: Laterza, 1940. (Scrittori d'Italia, N 173) 444 pp

Spallucci, M. — La poesia dialettale romagnola. *Milano*: L'Arola, 1938. 209 pp

Verde, R. — Studio sulle rime del Petrarca *Catania*: Studio ed. moderno, 1939. 379 pp

SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE

Ey, L. — Portugiesische Konversations-Grammatik. *Heidelberg*: Groos, 1939 123 pp.

Kluge, F. H. — Iberoamerikanische Grosszeitungen. *Hamburg*: Hans. Gildenverlag, 1940 vii + 177 pp

Litschauer, Fr. — Spanische Kulturgeschichte. I, II *Leipzig*: Bernina Verlagsgesellschaft, 1939. 1272 pp

Santillana, Marqués de. — Prose and verse, chosen by J. B. Trend *London*: Dolphin, 1940 xviii + 129 pp

GENERAL

Dahlerup, Verner. — Ordbog over det danske Sprog Nittend Bnd, sjagger-skæppevis. *Copenhagen*: Gyldendalske Boghandel, 1940 1450 cols.

Grueningen, J. P. von. — The Swiss in the U. S *Madison, Wis*: Sw-Amer. Hist Soc, 1940 153 pp

Kierkegaard, S. — Stages on life's way. Translated by Walter Lowrie *Princeton, N. J.*: Princeton U. Press, 1940 Pp viii + 472. \$6.00.

Kuhn, A. — Bibliographie, 1936-37 *ZRP*., Supplementhefte LVI-LVII. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1940. xvi + 361 pp.

Pignatelli, T. — L'opera drammatica di N. Jorga. *Rome*: Cenacolo, 1939. xxiv + 608 pp.

Thompson, C. R. — The Translations of Lucian by Erasmus and St Thomas More. *Princeton* diss revised. *Ithaca, N. Y*: 1940. 52 pp.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LVI

MARCH, 1941

Number 3

THREE NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THE *CANTERBURY* *TALES*

Professor Manly states in his section on the Classification of the MSS of the *Canterbury Tales*. "It has been tacitly assumed by most students . . . that the C. T. MSS are all derived from a copy which Chaucer put into circulation shortly before his death and to which was added his deathbed Retraction. It is true that some scholars discussed the evolution of the C. T. as being represented by a succession of extant MSS, but it is clear that in such discussions only the single feature of the arrangement of the tales was borne in mind and the general characteristics and textual relations of the MSS were entirely neglected."¹ The argument in the notes which follow is based entirely upon the textual relations of the manuscripts. It will be observed that the results yielded by this evidence accord in all respects with views which I have previously advanced in regard to the Order of the Tales.

I

The "Merrye wordes of the Hoost" (E 1212^{a-c}) stand at the end of the Clerk's tale in 22 MSS² and in Cx¹ and Thynne's print. On the other hand they are lacking in 35 MSS.³ The commentators have offered various suggestions in regard to this "Host's Stanza." Skeat's earlier opinion was that Chaucer wrote it to follow E 1162, which he regarded as marking the original conclusion of the Tale. This opinion, however, he subsequently re-

¹ Manly and Rickert's Text of the Cant Tales, II 29-30

² Manly's groups *a* and *b** plus Hg El Bo² Gg Ln Bw En³ Ad¹ Ha² Np Py Ry² Se

³ The three members of group *c*, the twenty-four of group *d**, and eight others—see Manly's list vi. 386.

tracted as "entirely baseless."⁴ Robinson says of these lines "They are probably part of a cancelled link, originally intended to follow l. 1169" (p. 1009). Manly, after taking note of the earlier arrangement of the Clerk's Envoy concluding with l. 1200, remarks "It was at this time perhaps that Chaucer began to write the link to some following tale of which the Host Stanza, preserved in some MSS, is the sole remnant. Dissatisfied with the link he had begun to write, he discarded this stanza and altered the position of the last three stanzas of the Envoy into the present standard form" (III. 473).

Each of these three authorities, it will be observed, assigns a different position to the Host's Stanza, though they agree that it was later discarded by Chaucer. Indeed, the only scholar, it would appear, who has dissented from this opinion is Brusendorff (*The Chaucer Tradition*, p. 76).

It is singular that so much discussion should have been provoked in regard to a matter in which the evidence of the manuscripts seems unmistakable. The conclusion of the Clerk's tale in its revised form⁵ is contained in '18 MSS and Cx¹, and in every one of these the Host's Stanza occurs immediately following E 1212:

And lat hym care, and wepe, and wrynge, and waille

On the other hand, of the 23 MSS which preserve the earlier arrangement of the Envoy without the reference to the Wife of Bath, all but four (Ha² Bw Ry² and Py) lack the text of the Host's Stanza. How, then, can it be maintained that Chaucer was "dissatisfied with the link he had begun to write," or that "he discarded this stanza and altered the position of the last three stanzas of the Envoy"?

It is to be noted further that among the manuscripts which contain this "discarded" stanza are Hg, El, Gg, Bo² and all the MSS of Manly's group *a*—in other words comprising the full list of those manuscripts which Manly and Chaucerians generally regard as offering the most mature and well-considered text of the *Canterbury Tales*. Manly himself, in discussing the Host's Stanza, comments on the manuscript evidence in these words: "Strangely

⁴ *Evolution of the C T*, pp 8 and 26

⁵ *I e* with the reference to the Wife of Bath (E 1170-6) and the stanzas of the Envoy in rearranged order.

enough, it is preserved almost solely in MSS containing the latest work" (II, 265).

In the face of this evidence only the most weighty reasons would seem to justify the conclusion that this stanza was later cancelled by Chaucer. In point of fact only two objections have been alleged by those who decline to admit this stanza to the text of the *Canterbury Tales*.

- (1) It is pointed out that the three lines

Oure Hooste seyde, and swoor, ' By Goddes bones,
Me were levere than a barel ale
My wyf at hoom had herd this legend ones! '

find a later echo in the Prologue of the Monk's tale:

Our Hooste seyde, ' As I am feithful man,
And by that precious corpus Madrian,
I hadde levere than a barel ale
That Goodehef, my wyf, hadde herd this tale! '

Chaucer, it is argued, would have wished to cancel the earlier passage in order to avoid this repetition. This involves the dangerous procedure of applying our own standards of judgment and attempting to re-write the tales in accordance with them. Are we warranted in excluding lines which have overwhelming manuscript support simply because *in our opinion* Chaucer would not have allowed this phrasal repetition in widely separated sections of the *Canterbury Tales*? Brusendorff refuses to consider this objection seriously, remarking: "Chaucer's tendency to repeat himself is well known" (p. 76, note 2).

- (2) The retention of the Host's stanza, it is asserted, spoils the effect of the opening line of the Merchant's Prologue,

Wepying and waylyng, care and oother sorwe,

which obviously was intended to echo the final line of the Clerk's Envoy. This objection is categorically posed by Skeat, who holds that the rearrangement by which the Envoy concluded with this line "rendered the suppression of the Host-stanza absolutely necessary in order that l. 1213 may be an echo of l. 1212." But such literal-mindedness does injustice to Chaucer's dramatic perception. Can we suppose that after the seven lines interjected by the Host the Merchant would have completely forgotten the Clerk's Envoy?

The introduction of this stanza does not weaken the dramatic effect, indeed, as Brusendorff penetratingly observes, "the break caused by the jocular words of the Host makes the Merchant's exclamation all the more effective."

Manly remarks further concerning the Host's stanza: "Its status seems, therefore, to be the same as that of ML Endlink—a bit of Chaucerian work but rejected because of change of plan" (II, 265). There is, however, this radical difference: the MSS containing the ML Endlink "are all of the *b*-cd*¹ group or usually affiliated with it" (Manly, III, 229), whereas the Host's Stanza is found in all MSS. of the *a* group and also in Hg El Gg Bo² En³ and Ad¹—all of which, however, lack the ML Endlink. Without going into more tedious detail, the testimony of the manuscripts makes it clear that the Host's Stanza is not, as Manly suggests, the "sole remnant" of an early link which was later cancelled.

II

Following the Merchant's tale in the standard text is a link which editors usually designate as the Epilogue to the Merchant's tale and the Squire's Prologue. According to the numbering given to these lines (E 2419-40 and F 1-8) this passage extends across the boundary between Groups E and F. But in the MSS the lines run on without a break of any kind, and the entire section is included under a single heading, either the Prologue of the Squire or the Prologue of the Franklin. McCormick and Manly are justified therefore in protesting that this passage should be regarded as a single unit. Nonetheless, the fact that this link is variously employed to unite the tales of Merchant and Squire, Merchant and Franklin, and Clerk and Franklin, makes it more convenient to discuss it from the point of view of these several functions.

In entering upon this discussion it should be borne in mind that the earlier arrangement of the tales in the Marriage Group was E²DE¹—an arrangement which persists in virtually all the *d* MSS.⁶ Subsequently the Merchant's tale (E²) was shifted to follow the Clerk's and was anchored in its new position by altering the text of the Clerk's Envoy and by appending to it the Merchant's headlink (E 1213-44).⁷

⁶ See my article, "The Evolution of the Canterbury Marriage Group" (*PMLA* XLVIII, 1041-59).

⁷ See Manly and Rickert, *Text of the Canterbury Tales*, II, 243-4.

In the MSS of group *d* the Franklin's tale follows the Clerk's, and in eleven of these manuscripts⁸ these tales are linked by two 7-line stanzas, textually related to E 2419-40 and F 1-8 in the standard text and usually referred to as the "shortened form" of this link. Both these 7-line stanzas are generally condemned as spurious, although they exhibit a notable difference in quality. While the second of these stanzas is unquestionably the bungling work of a scribe, the first seems to deserve more careful scrutiny. I give the text of this stanza according to Ry² (1420-50) as recorded in Manly's *Corpus of Variants*, noting also the variant readings in SI¹ (1420-50) and Lc (1430-50).

I haue a wyf [quoth oure hoste, Lc] thogh she poore be
 Yet she hath [hath she, SI, Lc] an heep of vices, lo!
 For of hir tonge a mochel shrewe is she
 And [Fore, SI, Lc] to my wil þe contrarie wil she do
 Ther of no fors lat alle swiche thynges go
 But wite ye what in conseil be it seyð
 Me reweth soore that I am to hire teyð

Now, making due allowance for inaccuracies on the part of fifteenth-century scribes, I submit that these lines have a truly Chaucerian flavor. The only linguistic objection to this stanza which editors have pointed out is the riming of open and close *ō* in *do · lo · go*. The exceptional occurrence of these rimes in Chaucer is admitted both by ten Brink⁹ and Skeat,¹⁰ though neither of these authorities appears to recognize the extent of them. I have noted 21 instances in the *Boke of the Duchesse*, one in *Parliament of Foules*, three in *Hous of Fame*, eight in *Troilus*, three in *Legend of Good Women*; and have counted eight cases in the four *Canterbury Tales* examined. In the following list I include only instances of *do* riming with either *wo*, *so*, *thoo* (adv.), *two*, *a-two*, *ago*, or *mo*.

Allas! what shal I thanne do (BD 1191)
 That any woman myghte do (HF 261)
 O Eneas, what wol, ye do (HF 320)
 And seyde, "Allas! what is me best to do?" (TC I. 828)
 And spedde as wel in love as men now do (TC II 26)
 A kynges sone in armes wel to do (TC II 165)

⁸ These MSS are Bw, D1, Ha², Lc, Ld², Mg, N1, Ry², SI¹ and En² (see McCormick, *MSS of Cant T*, p. xxvi) F1 also has this identical stanza but mistakenly places it following the Merchant's tale.

⁹ *Language and Metre of Chaucer*, § 31

¹⁰ *Chaucer Canon*, § 44.

The treason that to wommen hath ben do' (TC II 793)
 By lenger weye than it was wont to do (TC v 662)
 He shal ben holpen, how so that we do (LGW, 1984)
 What devel have I with the knyf to do? (LGW, 2694)
 Ylike wel, whan they han al ydo (CYT 850)
 Shul weiche al thyng which that shal heer be do (CYT 1155)

Since no one, surely, would condemn these lines as spurious, the riming of *do go* in the stanza before us is hardly decisive against its genuineness.

As we have already observed, the Host's stanza, with its reaction to the tale of Griselda, is lacking in nearly all the MSS of group *d*. Here now in eleven *d*-MSS, but not in those of any other group, is a 7-line stanza which would have served the same purpose. Moreover, six of the lines in this stanza are incorporated as couplets in the so-called Merchant's Epilogue (E 2427-32). It seems desirable, therefore, to examine attentively the relation of this 7-line stanza in these *d*-MSS and in the text of the Epilogue.

In the first place it is important to observe that without exception the eleven MSS containing this stanza present the Clerk's envoy according to its original form and also retain the earlier arrangement of the Marriage Group tales (E² DE¹). The Epilogue (E 2419-40), on the other hand, being appended to the Merchant's tale, properly belongs to the stage in which E² had been shifted from its earlier position at the head of the Marriage Group.

The Merchant's headlink (E 1213-44) is not found in any MS. of the *d* or *c* group, and is universally regarded as later than the tale itself. In the case of the Epilogue the evidence, though not so decisive, also points strongly in the same direction: it is lacking in all the *b* and *c* MSS, as well as in a large majority of the *d*-MSS. Accordingly, there is no reason to doubt that it dates from a period subsequent to the re-arrangement of the Marriage Group.

The 7-line stanza, according to the usual view, represents a scribal abridgment of the 22-line Merchant's Epilogue (see Manly III. 481). The scribe, we are told, perceiving that some of the lines in the Epilogue were not appropriate in a link following the Griselda story, threw away lines 2419-26 and 2433-40 entire and saved only three couplets (2427-32), rearranging these into a 7-line stanza by transposing lines 2 and 3 and adding a new line,

And to my wil þe contrarie wil she do,

with obvious reference to the Clerk's tale.

One may doubt whether a scribe would have treated a genuine Chaucer link with such reckless improvidence. As evidence on this point, one may cite the means resorted to by the Petworth scribe in dealing with this situation. Instead of sacrificing sixteen lines of his text he emended "Now such a wyf" (2420) to "Alle euel wyues," changed "Lo whiche" (2421) to "for mony," and "By this Marchauntes tale" (2425) to "By many ensamples," thus erasing the most obvious allusions to the story of January and May. The scribe of Mm did not even trouble to make these emendations but introduced the Epilogue directly after the Clerk's tale without any alterations whatever.

It seems more reasonable on the whole to regard the 7-line stanza as being the original kernel and the Epilogue as Chaucer's later expansion. How it was built into its context will be seen by comparing the text of the stanza printed above with that of the Epilogue as it appears in the Hengwrt MS.:

- Ey goddes mercy seyde oure hoost tho
 2420 Now swich a wyf I prey god kepe me fro
 Lo whiche sleightes and subtiltees
 In wommen ben for ay as bisy as bees
 Ben they vs sely men for to deceyue
 And from a sooth euere wol they weyue
 2425 By this marchantes tale it preueth weel
 But doutelees as trewe as any steel

 I haue a wyf thogh þ^t she poore be
 But of hir tonge a labbyng shrewe is she
 And yit she hath an heep of vices mo
 2430 Ther of no fors lat alle swiche thynges go
 But wite ye what in conseil be it seyde
 Me reweth soore I am vn to hire teyde
 ffor and I sholde rekenen euery vice
 Which þ^t she hath ywis I were to nyce
 2435 And cause why it sholde reported be
 And toold to hire of somme of this meynee
 Of whom it nedeth nat for to declare
 Syn wommen konnen oute swich chaffare
 And eek my wit suffiseth nat ther to
 2440 To tellen al wherfore my tale is do ¹¹

Though for the most part these lines run on smoothly, some traces of the welding process are still visible. The inversion of natural

¹¹ I am under obligations to Mrs Germaine Dempster for transcribing these lines from the photostat of the Hengwrt MS.

order presented in lines 2426 and 2427 is somewhat difficult. And in the transposed lines 2428-9 the sequence is not as logical as in the stanzaic version: the phrase "thogh that she poore be" does not connect as well with "But of hir tonge" as with "Yet she hath an heep of vices, lo!" in the 7-line stanza. And finally, although the suppression of the line "For to my will þe contrarie wil she do" has removed the unmistakable allusion to the obedience of Griselda, a distinct reminiscence of her poverty still remains in the phrase "thogh that she poore be," which is utterly devoid of meaning in its present position following the story of January and May.

In the 7-line stanza the line, "Me reweth soore that I am to hire teyd," brings to a natural conclusion the expression of the Host's marital sentiments. But in expanding the Host's speech Chaucer adds a postscript as it were (2433-40) which contains a covert allusion to the Wife of Bath. This is very similar, it will be noted, to his procedure in the Clerk's Tale, where a reference to the Wife of Bath is inserted in a stanza (E 1170-76) which is lacking in the earlier form of the text as represented in the MSS. of group *d*.

In the *d*-MSS the heading of these two stanzas reads:

Here endeth the Clerke of Oxenfordes tale
Here begynneth the prologe of the Frankeleyn,

and in Hg the Epilogue of the Merchant is headed:

Here is ended the Marchantes tale of Ianuarie
Here folwen the wordes of the worthy Hoost to the Frankeleyn

Both are designated Prologues to the Franklin's tale, the difference consists in the shift of the Merchant's tale from the position in which it stood in group *d*: E² DE¹ F². The position of the Merchant's tale in Hg, Ht, and I₁ seems in itself to suggest a stage somewhat later than in group *d*.

In these three MSS E 2419-40 is followed without break by F 1-8, but with the word "Squier" altered to "Sire Frankeleyn." The fact that in these MSS the Franklin follows rather than the Squire is probably attributable to the continued influence of the group *d* tradition. Neither the scribes of group *d* nor the Hg scribe, it should be noted, had the proper Squire-Franklin link (F 673-708) since in their text of this link the word "Franklin"

had been altered to "Merchant." But it is not easy to guess from what source the Hengwrt scribe picked up his text of F 1-8, or to decide whether the alteration of Squire to Franklin originated with the Hengwrt scribe or was present in his exemplar.¹²

It is clear at all events that the Hengwrt scribe, though he discarded the ML-Sq link of the *b*, *c*, and *d* MSS, failed to perceive the proper function of F 1-8 as headlink to the Squire's tale.

The second of the 7-line stanzas, which in eleven *d* MSS form a bridge from the Clerk to the Franklin, is a crowning example of scribal inanity. Whatever uncertainty there may be in other respects there can be no question that this stanza and the one which precedes are the work of different authors. Nor does the source of this second stanza present any problem, for obviously it was an attempt to re-write in rime-royal the 8-line link to the Franklin which we find in Hg and the small group of associated MSS.

In concluding this examination of the Merchant's Epilogue and its somewhat complex relationship, it may be well to re-state briefly the conclusions which have been reached.

1. The Merchant's Epilogue is later than the tale to which it is attached, and belongs to the period after the Merchants tale had been shifted from its original position preceding the Wife of Bath's tale (E² DE).

2. The first of the two 7-line stanzas which serve as a Clerk-Franklin link in eleven *d* MSS appears to be a genuine Chaucer stanza, and is to be sharply distinguished from the second, which is plainly spurious.

3. The three couplets in the Merchant's Epilogue (E 2427-32) which parallel lines in this 7-line stanza still contain allusions to the Griselda story.

4. The order and phrasing of these couplets in the Epilogue show that they are not the original form, but have been adapted from the stanzaic version.

5. The bungling character of the second of the 7-line stanzas shows that it is the work of a later scribe who attempted to re-write into a rime-royal stanza the 8-line adaptation of F 1-8 as it appears in Hg and a group of associated MSS.

¹² The Lincoln MS affords an interesting example of a scribe's perplexity in regard to these lines, which he first marked "Francel" and then in the margin altered to "Squire." See Manly's comments on this MS (I, 333-4.)

III

Our conclusions in the case of the Host's Stanza and the Merchant's Epilogue are further confirmed when we proceed to apply the results of manuscript evidence to the textual problem presented by the much-discussed couplet in the Merchant's tale (E 1305-6). Brusendorff (*op cit.* p. 68) makes the diversity of readings in this couplet his basis for dividing the MSS into what he terms the "Oxford group" and the "All England tradition." Let us note first the readings of the MSS representing the "All England tradition," supplementing Brusendorff's data by including manuscript readings which were inaccessible to him, as they are recorded in Manly's Corpus of Variants.

- (1) E 1305-6 according to E1 and Gg read as follows:

And if thou take a wyf unto thyn hoold,
Ful lightly maystow been a cokewold.

With these Se agrees, except for the reading "in thyn age oolde" in 1305b

- (2) The five group *a* MSS (Cn Ma Dd En¹ Ds) and Ch Ry¹ read (with slight variation).

And if thou take a wyf of highe lynage,
She shall be hauteyn and of grete costage.

- (3) Four MSS (Bo² Ha⁵ Ps Ha⁴) read:

And if thou take a wyf be wel yware (Ha⁴ be war)
Of o peril which to declaren y ne dare

- (4) Both Bw and Py present unique variants which need not be considered, while in Hg a late hand completes 1305 with the words "she wole destroye" and offers a spurious line in 1306.

Thy good substance and thy body annoye.

- (5) Hg (original hand) and Hk end 1305 with "wyf" and leave 1306 blank. F1 Ra² and Ht also end 1305 with "wyf," but insert a spurious line in 1306.

- (6) Finally, both 1305 and 1306 are omitted in Cp La Sl² He Ne Cx¹ Tc² Ha³ En³ Ad¹ Ra³ Tc¹ Ln.

Such is the "All England tradition": thirteen MSS omit this couplet altogether; at least nine others offer readings which are

obviously nothing more than scribal patchings—only Nos. 1 and 2 could by any possibility be regarded as Chaucerian. The first is represented by three MSS (El Gg and the late variant Se), the second is represented by the five MSS of Manly's group *a* plus Ch and Ry.¹

In contrast to this "All England tradition," with its subdivisions and its high percentage of manuscript omissions are the sixteen MSS of the "Oxford group" · D1 En² Ha² I1 Lc Mg Ld¹ Pw Mm Gl Ph³ Ry² Ld² Sl¹ To and Nl. All these agree in the following reading of these lines (except that Nl omits "to the" in 1305):

And if thou take a wyf þat to the is vntrewe
ful ofte tyme it shal the rewe

Of this group Brusendorff speaks very disparagingly "On account of the worthlessness of the group I have generally not troubled to collate the unprinted MSS belonging to it, but rely on the evidence gathered by Zupitza and Koch . . . and an independent collation of the printed authorities" (p. 68, note 2). At the same time he recognizes that "the three typical representatives of the Oxford group sometimes join in readings which are actually superior to those of the All England tradition and must be considered authoritative." It will be noticed also that he does not cite instances of inferior readings from the lines we are discussing.

To account for the variant readings in E 1305-6 Brusendorff accepts the theory first put forward by Tatlock. Observing that *all* the MSS containing these lines agree in the first half of 1305 in reading "And if thou take a wyf," Tatlock conjectured that Chaucer in his own draft left 1305 unfinished and never completed the couplet. This is the explanation accepted also by Manly, who in his edition prints only the first half of 1305 and leaves 1306 blank. In his Critical Notes on 1305-06 he remarks.

The condition of this couplet in the various MSS makes it clear that O² contained only the first half of the first line. This is one of the most striking instances of the fact that the C T had not received Chaucer's final touches (III, 474)

Though the simplicity of the proposed explanation renders it at first sight attractive, it overlooks some obvious improbabilities. Is it likely that Chaucer's poetic invention would fail him in the middle of a line? Or if Chaucer in l. 1305, as Brusendorff (p. 67,

n. 3) suggests, "had started a new argument only to drop it at once," is it likely that he would delete the second half of the line, leaving "If thou take a wyf," with its tantalizing suggestion, uncanceled?

Instead of supposing that Chaucer left l 1305 unfinished or deleted only the second half of the line, it seems more reasonable to recognize in this couplet another instance of Chaucer's alteration of his text, similar to those noted by Manly (II. 38-39) and by Miss Rickert (II. 496-501). If Chaucer had inserted in his own draft a revision of 1305b and 1306 in a careless or illegible hand, this would easily account for the perplexity of the scribes. Some support is given to this conjecture by the fact that all the sixteen MSS with the *untrewe rewe* readings belong to Manly's d^1 group, and that all of them (except En^2 , which after E1166 has lost leaves) give the conclusion of the Clerk's tale according to the earlier, unrevised arrangement. And, as I have previously shown,¹³ in discussing Manly's list of Chaucer's alterations, it is the d^* group which preserves the unrevised form of the text.

A few additional instances from the Merchant's tale may be cited in which the d^1 MSS appear to give the original readings:

In E1417 the d^* group (supported in this case by *a b* and *c*) reads:

She shal nat passe sixteen yeer certeyn

Manly on the strength of fourteen MSS (among them Hg El and Gg) reads "twenty" instead of "sixteen," but in his note he shows a preference for "sixteen":

The ancestors of the Hg El and Hk- En^* groups seem to have felt that sixteen was too young for January to set as a limit for the age of his wife, but January's choice of the sixteen-year-old is in harmony with the humor of the tale as a whole (III. 474)

In E2125 Manly, on the strength of cd^* and *b*, reads:

O noble Ouyde sooth seistow god woot

against the readings of group *a* and 15 other MSS (including Hg El and Gg). In his note he identifies the reading of his text as that of O^1 (III. 477).

In E2229, following Hg Bo² Py El Gg Dd Hk En^3 (and "proserpyne" in Ch Ha⁴) Manly prints the rime-word as "Proserpyne,"

¹³ *MLN.*, LV (1940), 613-9

although *all other* MSS show the -a ending. In E 2230 (following *cd*¹ and *Ra*³ *Tc*¹ *Ln Ry*¹) he reads: "Which that he rauysshed out of Proserpyna," and offers the following comment in his notes:

The evidence of the MSS shows clearly that the words which stand in our text stood in *O*¹. Apparently also the scribe of *O*¹ instead of transcribing from Chaucer's draft the name of the country in which the ravishment of Proserpina occurred, repeated the word "Proserpina" from the preceding line. Some scribes undertook to emend the obvious error by supplying a suitable word. The line may have been omitted or incomplete in the earliest ancestors of *Hg El a Gg Hk En*³, for *Hg* left the line blank (III 477).

This seems an interesting parallel to the procedure of *Hg* in the case of E 1305-6.

In *El* 2290 Manly reads (on the basis of *Hg Ht Ad*³ *Ln Ry*¹ *c d*⁺):

Nys noon but god but neither he nor she.

He adds the following note on the line: "The reading of *O*¹, which is well supported by MS authority, was apparently not understood by several of the scribes. The most popular emendation was that of *El*, which was copied by other MSS" (III. 478). Brusendorff, who regarded the readings of the "Oxford group" as generally inferior to those of the "All England tradition," made the comparison without taking into account the possibility that Chaucer himself may have made revisions of his lines. In that case a less satisfactory reading would not necessarily represent a scribal corruption, but might be the preservation of Chaucer's earlier, unrevised text. This, in fact, is exactly the situation which meets us again and again in MSS of the *d*^{*} group, where it is certain that we are dealing with early tradition.

If Chaucer first wrote E 1305-6 with the *vtrewe rewe rime*, as we find the couplet in the sixteen MSS, and then, not satisfied with it, attempted (perhaps more than once) to improve the lines, we should have another case, similar to those already pointed out, in which group *d*^{*} preserves the original form of the text.

CARLETON BROWN

New York University

THE TEXTUAL EVIDENCE FOR "THE SCHOOL OF NIGHT" *

The endless game of finding topical allusions in Elizabethan literature, when it is not played in open rebellion against the rules of common sense, requires that the suggestion of secondary meanings rest upon something more than coincidence between the poet's fiction and the historian's fact. The harmony, real or fancied, between the incidents of a tale and events contemporaneous with the telling can produce a host of rival and mutually contradictory "interpretations" of a single work. What is needed is a link between story and event, some evidence, internal or external, that the writer intended the application proposed by his interpreter.

Scholars who see in *Love's Labour's Lost* satirical references to the academic pretensions of the Raleigh circle¹ believe that such links may be found in (1) the phrase "Schoole of night," read in the light of Parsons' strictures on Raleigh's "School of Atheism"; and (2) the fact that Chapman, in the dedication of *The Shadow of Night*, a poem presenting a philosophy opposite to that of Berowne, praises highly men connected with the Raleigh circle. The Jesuit writer's "School of Atheism" and Chapman's studious noblemen, with their satellites, are then united, according to the interpretation, to form a group known as "The School of Night." In a general preoccupation with the merits and demerits of the parallelisms and identifications suggested (concerning which there is by no means unanimity of opinion),² the textual clue in *Love's Labour's Lost*, iv, in, 250-1, upon which the theorizing rests has not

* The writer gratefully acknowledges the aid of a Folger Library Fellowship in the pursuit of studies of which the present article represents a part.

¹ See Arthur Acheson, *Shakespeare and the Rival Poet* (1903), pp 76-99; *Love's Labour's Lost*, ed. Sir Arthur Quiller Couch and John Dover Wilson (Cambridge, 1923), especially pp xviii-xxxiv, 97-130, and the notes on iv, iii, 250-2; *Wallobie His Avisa*, ed. G. B. Harrison (1926), pp 181-231; G. B. Harrison, *An Elizabethan Journal, 1591-1594* (1928), pp 398-400; Frances A. Yates, *A Study of "Love's Labour's Lost"* (Cambridge, 1936); M. C. Bradbrook, *The School of Night* (Cambridge, 1936).

² Miss Yates, *op. cit.*, p. 9, writes: "I think one may say that this theory is now more or less generally accepted." Even this limited statement is scarcely warranted by the widespread dissent, or the restricted and conditional assent, of Shakespearean editors and commentators.

received adequate attention. The present note is limited to a re-examination of a fundamental problem does the textual evidence warrant the New Cambridge editors' acceptance of the reading "School of Night" in support of the theory originally advanced by Mr. Arthur Acheson?

The King's comment on Berowne's extravagant praise of his "black" mistress reads in the 1598 Quarto as follows:

O paradox, Blacke is the badge of Hell,
The hue of dungions, and the Schoole of night:
And beauties crest becomes the heauens well³

The word "Schoole" has troubled Shakespearean editors, who propose a variety of emendations. The New Cambridge editors retain the wording of *Q*, but eliminate a comma after "dungions" (with other changes in punctuation) and capitalize "night," so that the lines read.

O paradox! Black is the badge of hell,
The hue of dungeons and the School of Night,
And beauty's crest becomes the heavens well!⁴

In justification of the reading, they accept Mr. Acheson's contention that "Shakespeare wrote 'Schoole of night' and was referring to an actual coterie, for which presumably Chapman composed his *Shadow of Night*, 1594, and upon which the 'academe' of Navarre is itself a satire."⁵ But this comes perilously close to explaining the King's speech by the theory and then using the speech to support the theory. If we do not assume the truth of Mr. Acheson's application of the lines, what *independent* justification is there for this interpretation of the phrase? "Schoole" has the authority of *Q*, and the editors find in the characteristics of the *Q* spelling

³ *A Pleasant Conceited Comedie Called, Loues labors lost* . . . (1598), sig. F2r Hereafter this edition will be referred to as *Q* Variant readings First Folio, "paradoxe"; 1631 Quarto, "Paradoxe"; First Folio and 1631 Quarto, "dungeons"

⁴ IV, III, 250-2. Unless otherwise indicated, references to *Love's Labour's Lost* will be given according to the numbering adopted by Sir Arthur Quiller Couch and John Dover Wilson in the work which has been popularly designated "The New Cambridge Edition" References to other plays by Shakespeare will be normalized to the (conventional) numbering used in the one volume *Works*, ed. George Lyman Kittredge (1936).

⁵ See note on IV, III, 251.

throughout the play added reasons for retaining⁶ the word. But other textual changes, of questionable soundness, are made in order to infer for that word a special meaning. The general and specific comments relating to the readings adopted will clarify the point. First, on spelling

The Folio compositors erred through haste, the Quarto compositor worked laboriously, with his eye glued to the "copy" before him. Indeed, certain misprints suggest that at times he just traced as best he could the outlines of the letters before him without asking himself at all what the words meant. And since the Quarto is full of abnormal spellings, which obviously come from the "copy," a "copy" which as we shall see was almost certainly in Shakespeare's own handwriting, this text is a mine for students of Shakespearian spelling.⁷

This description, as we shall see, works both ways: it suggests the possibility of errors in literal transcription upon which previous editors have based their emendations no less than it suggests the possibility that the author's words are preserved, however curiously spelled.

The New Cambridge editors' comment on the punctuation of *Q* is less favorable:

But if the spelling of the Quarto be Shakespearian, the punctuation, we have sadly to admit, is very far from being so. Capell described it as "enormous bad," and though to-day we are able to read 16th century punctuation with very different eyes from his, we can do nothing but echo his judgment. [The punctuation] is not only frequently absurd but greatly overweighted throughout, especially in the matter of full-stops, which occur in great profusion. On the other hand, at times one comes across passages (e.g. Armado's first letter, and the songs at the end of the play), in which the stops appear to be very much as the author left them.⁸

In other words, the editors, like many of their predecessors, feel free to punctuate as they please. Of the "Schoole of night" passage they write:

⁶ Many editors retain the word in the text and, in their notes, either attempt an explanation on the basis of the common meanings of "school" (e.g., H. C. Hart, in the Arden edition), or suggest emendations (e.g., W. G. Clark and W. A. Wright, in the first Cambridge edition, 1863, with additions in 1891).

⁷ Pp. 102-3.

⁸ P. 104. For an explanation of the system of punctuation used in this edition, see *The Tempest* (Cambridge, 1921), pp. lvii-lx.

It should be noted that the Q prints "The hue of dungeons, and the the Schoole of night" as if "hue" and "Schoole" balanced each other; but the punctuation of this text is quite unreliable and we have omitted the comma.⁹

The editors believe that we have to do with a bumbling compositor who, in his labored setting of type, frequently preserved the spelling of his copy but seldom the punctuation. As the comment just quoted indicates, the theory allows quite as much latitude for subjective decisions on specific points as less "scientific" editions enjoy. The capitalization of "night" has no textual authority, nor is the capitalization of "Schoole" in Q necessarily significant. The compositor has been very generous with initial capitals for common nouns, especially for words beginning with *c*, *s*, *d*, and *o*, although the frequency is merely relative.

How does the problem appear if Mr. Acheson's theory is put aside and textual considerations are given priority? What conclusions can be inferred from the syntax of the line, from the context, and from the phrasal and topical analogies in Shakespeare's works? If the emendations which are summarily rejected in the New Cambridge edition are considered without predisposition for the "School of Night" hypothesis, how do they stand the test of the customary practices of the New Cambridge editors?

Syntax

Both Mr. Acheson and the New Cambridge editors recognize that the "School of Night" reading, accepted as an allusion, makes better sense if the punctuation is altered. The note on the punctuation of the line, quoted above, is a more specific statement of Mr. Acheson's comment: "... the full gist of Shakespeare's reference becomes clear when we transpose the line and give the plain prose meaning: black is the hue of the school of night."¹⁰ The difficulty of the Q reading ("Black is the badge . . . the hue . . . the Schoole") for purposes of the theory is the statement that the School, a group of men, is black. Although the punctuation in the play as a whole is admittedly bad and it may be argued that the comma after "dungeons" is not essential, the Q pointing indicates clearly a triple parallelism in these lines. The conservative practice which retains "Schoole" should retain also the punctuation.

⁹ Note on iv, iii, 251 (pp. 162-3). ¹⁰ Acheson, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

The principle is well stated by R. B. McKerrow, and illustrated by a passage with just such internal punctuation as we find after "dungeons":

As regards punctuation my rule has been to allow this to remain unaltered whenever, though perhaps insufficient or careless, it is not clearly *mistaken*. And if there is a way of uttering the text—even though it be not our usual way—which corresponds with the punctuation, it appears to me that it would be definitely wrong to alter it.¹¹

Punctuation, Mr McKerrow believes, is "just as likely to preserve characteristics of the author's manuscript" as the spelling. These remarks apply primarily to the speaking of the lines; in the passage from *Love's Labour's Lost*, the punctuation not only indicates a verse cadence common in Shakespeare but also is syntactically correct.

Context and Analogies

Berowne has said of beauty that it is "the sun that maketh all things shine," and of his mistress, "No face is fair that is not full so black." The King agrees on the virtues of beauty, but denies that beauty is to be found in Berowne's mistress. To make black fair is a paradox which the King would set right by reasserting the conventionally accepted truth about beauty: black is black and fair is fair. He uses figurative language which is commonplace in Shakespeare and other Elizabethans. the quality of blackness is associated with hell, dungeons, and the "blackout" nights of the sixteenth century. The New Cambridge editors have noted the variations on "night" in *Romeo and Juliet* and *Lucrece*,¹² and the lady of sonnet 147 is "black as hell, as dark as night." Other instances of the usage in Shakespeare's works are cited below in the discussion of emendations. The King completes his denial of Berowne's paradox with "And beauty's crest becomes the heavens well"; i. e., true beauty, not that which Berowne admires, is fit for heavenly comparisons.¹³

¹¹ R. B. McKerrow, *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1939), p. 40. There follows, by way of example, discussion of the Folio punctuation of *3 Henry VI*, II, vi, 51-8.

¹² P. xxiv. See *Romeo and Juliet*, III, ii, 1-31, *Lucrece*, 764-812.

¹³ The context makes this reading of the line more probable than the New Cambridge editors' suggestion that it is intended as sarcasm. (See

Aside from parallels in usage, another kind of analogy which may throw light upon the problem is Shakespeare's method of introducing topical allusions into his plays. Those concerning which there is any unanimity of opinion are recognizable, in the context, as allusions the reference to Essex in *Henry V*, to Elizabeth in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*¹⁴ In the case of *Love's Labour's Lost*, the New Cambridge editors find an allusion in a single phrase, one of three symbols for blackness, introduced into a passage of sixty lines devoted to sophistry and banter on the familiar "black is fair" theme The interpretation infers that "Schoole of night," meaning Raleigh and his associates, would suggest blackness as readily as do hell and dungeons. Although sixteenth century references to or attacks upon the Raleigh coterie, collectively or singly, are not infrequent, the present writer is not aware of a single unmistakable instance in which the group was called "The School of Night." In other words, we are asked to believe that one phrase, picked by an alert and informed audience¹⁵ from its context or pointed by the actor, would convey a specific secondary meaning. It is rather much to ask, even of the presumably initiate, and it suggests a subtlety in the use of satire which one would be surprised to meet in Elizabethan literature.

Emendations

If, reversing the practice of the New Cambridge editors, we accept the punctuation of these lines, what can we make of

the notes by Johnson and Tollet in the Furness *Variorum* edition, iv, iii, 273.) Berowne's paradox begins with the question,

"What peremptory eagle-sighted eye
Dares look upon the heaven of her brow,
That is not blinded by her majesty?"

and includes the speeches already quoted In refutation of the paradox, the King naturally reaffirms the truth of *both* principles Berowne maintains his heresy until his companions exhaust their ribald jests and all unite in an attempt to justify the early violation of their solemn oath.

¹⁴ *Henry V*, v, ProI 29-34 *Midsummer Night's Dream*, II, I, 148-164. For further discussion of this view of Shakespeare's practice, see Edwin Greenlaw, *Studies in Spenser's Historical Allegory* (Baltimore, 1932), Chap II, "Elizabethan Fact and Modern Fancy"

¹⁵ The editors assume (p xxxiv) that the play was first performed privately in the house of some nobleman, possibly Southampton, opposed to Raleigh.

"Schoole"? Explanations of the word as it stands in this context,¹⁶ though not impossible, have not been received with general satisfaction, and the emendations proposed are numerous and varied. One cannot quarrel with the New Cambridge editors' skeptical (though highly inconsistent) attitude toward the over-enthusiastic revision of Shakespeare; but one may well question their dismissal of their predecessors' attempts to make sense of the passage by emendations,—“all of them rank guesses”¹⁷ The fact is that several proposed emendations are justified by exactly the processes followed elsewhere by the New Cambridge editors (when there is no suspected allusion at stake) and explained by them in the Textual Introduction to the edition¹⁸ The arguments supporting at least one much favored emendation are presented in no vain hope of proving what now seems beyond possibility of proof, but to illustrate the kind of evidence which has been neglected in favor of the allusion theory.

Retaining the *Q* reading in the text, the editors of the first Cambridge edition suggest the reading “suit,” possibly written “shoote” in the copy. In evidence they cite: the pun on “shooter” (“sutor”) in *iv*, 1, 107; the reading, in *Q* and *F*¹, “shue” for “sue” (*iii*, 1, 203); “shout” for “suit” in the quartos of *Henry V* (*iii*, vi, 81); “three-shewted” for “three-suited” in *Lear* (*ii*, ii, 16); and “Suters Hill” in Hall’s *Satires* (*vi*, i, 67) for what is now called “Shooters Hill.” Keightley adds a pun on “sutor” and “archer” (“shooter”) in *The Puritan* (*ii*, 1, 85), and, as a parallel use of the figure, *Romeo and Juliet* (*iii*, ii, 10). “Come civil Night, Thou sober-suited matron all in black.”¹⁹

The *Variorum* note on the word “shooter” (*iv*, 1, 122 in that edition) includes additional examples from Elizabethan literature, among which may be cited “shute” in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*²⁰ (*ii*, 1, 220, *iii*, v, 126), and “shuter” and “shute” in

¹⁶ See note 6, and the explanations quoted in the Furness *Variorum* edition

¹⁷ P. xxix.

¹⁸ *The Tempest*, pp xl-xliii

¹⁹ For convenience of reference, the notes in this paragraph have been taken from the Furness *Variorum* edition of *Love’s Labour’s Lost* (1904), *iv*, iii, 272. In a few instances references have been expanded to include line numbers according to the one volume *Works*, ed G L Kittredge.

²⁰ 1602 Quarto, sigs. C2r and E3v.

The London Prodigall (I, 1, 39, 42, 124). When the Second Folio corrected a stage direction in *The Taming of the Shrew* (I, 1, 48), the word "sutor" was spelled "shuter." In the light of these examples, some editors have believed it possible that "Shoote of night" (i. e., "suit of night") in the copy was misread by the compositor as "Schoole of night."

Further investigation merely corroborates the observation that initial *s*, under certain conditions, was frequently pronounced and sometimes written *sh*. Robert Nares²¹ remarks, early in the nineteenth century, that "sutor" was and sometimes is pronounced "shooter", and H. C. Wyld²² notes "sheute" for "suit" in the Allyn papers, with other instances. An examination of a number of books printed by William White, printer of *Love's Labour's Lost*, shows the same occasional (but by no means frequent) interchange of *sh* for *s* that we find in III, 1, 203 ("shue" for "sue"): "soulders"²³ for "shoulders," "shuet"²⁴ for the more frequent "suet," "ishew"²⁵ for "issue," "Shooters-hill"²⁶ for the "Suters Hill" of Hall's *Satires*. Worth noting is "Shoole"²⁷ for "School," an error which occurs also on the title page of Gossons's *School of Abuse*, 1579. In two plays printed by White, *3 Henry VI*²⁸ and the 1610/11 edition of *The Spanish Tragedy*, there are no instances of the *sh* substitution in the spelling of "suit," "sue," or "sutor"; and the common spelling in Shakespeare's play,²⁹ regardless of printer, is "sute," with "suite" an occasional variant. There remains the fact that in *Love's Labour's Lost*, in other plays by Shakespeare, and in other works printed by William White may be found relevant illustrations of a spelling practice which, it has been suggested, led to the corruption of "Shoote" (or a closely allied form, e. g., "Shute"?) to "Schoole."

²¹ *A Glossary* (Stralsund, 1825), sub "sutor"

²² *A History of Modern Colloquial English* (1925), p. 293

²³ L. W. C., *A Verie Perfect Discourse, and order how to know the Age of a Horse* (1601), sig. A3^r

²⁴ *Ibid.*, sig. B2^r (Cf. "suet" sigs. E2^r and E3^r.)

²⁵ *Rapta Tatuo* (1604), sig. B1^r (STC 23705)

²⁶ *Ibid.*, sig. D4^r.

²⁷ J[ohn] G[reene], *A Refutation of the Apology for Actors* (1615), sig. A2^v

²⁸ *The True Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke* (1600). (STC 21006a)

²⁹ E. g., *Much Ado* (1600); *Lear* (1608 and [1619]); *Hamlet* (1603 and 1604).

Although the notes and commentary of the New Cambridge edition include, in one place or another, all the evidence³⁰ in favor of this emendation which may be found in the play itself, there is no discussion of that evidence in its bearing upon the "rank guess" of the first Cambridge editors. The New Cambridge editors print "sutor" in IV, 1, 107, and in their note accept the *Q* "shooter" as evidence of the "Shakespearean pronunciation," which "explains the point of the quibble." A cross reference to III, 1, 203, in which *Q* reads "shue," is made meaningless by a misprint of the *Q* reading "sue (F2) *Q*. 'sue' Cf. 'shooter' 4. 1. 107." In contrast to their rejection of "suit" and other "rank guesses" suggested for "Schoole," the editors are willing, in another instance, to credit the compositor with an error two stages removed from his copy. They accept Walker's emendation "love-suit" for *Q* "love-feat," with the following note: "The misprint ['feat' for 'suit'] can be explained thus: 'suit' might be taken for 'fait' (by *a. u.* confusion . . .) and 'fait' was a common 16th cent. spelling of 'feat'."³¹ The analysis assumes that the compositor misread the word and simultaneously altered the spelling of his misreading. And "love-feat," in its context, does make sense.

Other emendations for "Schoole" rest upon similar evidence, including the paleographic clues to which the New Cambridge editors so often resort. For example, "Shade," "Stole," and less probably "Scowl" could be misread in Elizabethan handwriting as "Schoole." Whatever the correct reading of the line may be, analogous phrases in Shakespeare's plays also indicate a strong possibility that for "Schoole" should be substituted the name of a garment, or of some frequently used attribute of night (e. g., "shade"). The following illustrations may be added to the pertinent lines already cited from the *Variorum* notes.³² "the

³⁰ See the remarks on spelling and punctuation quoted above in the preliminary discussion of this problem, and the illustrative list of mispellings (p 103 of the edition). Another possible instance of the interchange of *s* and *sh* is given in that list: *sedule* (*schedule*).

³¹ v, ii, 123, and note, which includes a cross reference to the Textual Introduction, *The Tempest*, p xli

³² Bartlett's *Concordance* lists many suggestive verbal parallels, but these selected examples are limited (except for "shade") to uses of figurative language comparable to that in the *Love's Labour's Lost* lines

cloak of night", ³³ "night's cloak", ³⁴ "night . . . Whose pitchy mantle"; ³⁵ "night's black mantle", ³⁶ "shades of night" ³⁷

In the light of the evidence, old and new, which bears upon an editorial decision on the reading of the line, there remain three possibilities from which the reader may choose (1) The *Q* reading is correct, and the word "Schoole" needs only a gloss such as H. C. Hart has offered, (2) the *Q* reading is correct except for punctuation, and "Schoole of night" is an allusion which would please and amuse the (assumed) special audience for whom *Love's Labour's Lost* was produced, and (3) the *Q* reading is incorrect and should be emended. If (1) is unsatisfactory, the choice lies between a reading (2) which assumes that a topical allusion may be found in a single phrase placed in an irrelevant context and given a wording which is unique for the application intended; and, on the other hand, a reading (3) which finds support in the principles adopted by the New Cambridge editors as well as in those of earlier editors. The present writer, believing that the lines contain no esoteric meaning, would extend to such shadowy allusions as this is said to be the New Cambridge editors' own indictment of the personal interpretations of Shakespeare's play and sonnets:

Yet we may protest, or at least enter a warning, that personal gossip based on nothing more secure than internal evidence interpreted through a critic's own proclivities of belief, may easily stray through excess into impertinence. We should be cautious, too, in listening to those who, all so variously, utilise the Sonnets to construct fancy histories of Shakespeare's personal life and actual experiences.³⁸

Discussion of further evidence bearing upon the "School of Night" theory lies outside the narrow limits of the present note, devoted to a consideration of the phrase alleged to be the textual link between *Love's Labour's Lost* and contemporary affairs. Briefly, among other obstacles to the interpretation are (1) the un-

³³ *Richard II*, III, II, 45

³⁴ *Romeo and Juliet*, II, II, 75.

³⁵ *1 Henry VI*, II, II, 1.

³⁶ *3 Henry VI*, IV, II, 22 Cf. *Romeo and Juliet*, III, II, 15.

³⁷ *Richard II*, V, VI, 43, cf. I, III, 177. Cf. also *Henry IV*, I, II, 29, and *Midsummer Night's Dream*, IV, I, 99

³⁸ *The Tempest*, pp. xix, xx.

certain date of the play,³⁹ (2) the unlikelihood that Shakespeare would make sport of a group which, on the evidence adduced to postulate its existence (i. e., Chapman's dedication to Royden), must include Shakespeare's dramatic patron,⁴⁰ and (3) the difficulty of an interpretation which finds the indictment of the so-called "School of Night" in a speech by a member of the "little academe" which is the vehicle of satire.⁴¹ The fundamental errors result from attempts to personalize the story. That Chapman's *Shadow of Night* and the speeches of Berowne present contrasting philosophies is true, that Raleigh and Northumberland were patrons of scientific learning is true, that the Raleigh coterie was accused of unorthodox beliefs is true. But there is no independent evidence—no evidence stronger than "a critic's own proclivities of belief"—to establish the *Q* reading "Schoole of night" as an allusion to Raleigh and his associates.

ERNEST A. STRATHMANN

Pomona College

³⁹ Even the hypothetical date (1593) suggested in support of the theory necessitates the inference that Shakespeare saw Chapman's poem ((1594) in manuscript See the New Cambridge edition, p 127 and note. "There is the less difficulty in believing this inasmuch as we happen to know that Marlowe had seen a copy of the poem before his death and had urged Chapman to print it, v. *Hero and Leander*, Sest III, ll. 195-97." The reader will find it instructive to read the lines in *Hero and Leander* on the basis of which we "know" this.

⁴⁰ See E K Chambers, *William Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1930), I, 337 In a paper read at a meeting of the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast, the present writer discussed the life and literary interests of Sir George Carey in relation to the "School of Night" theory This material will be included in a study of Sir Walter Raleigh and Elizabethan skepticism, now in preparation.

⁴¹ Janet Spens, "Notes on *Love's Labour's Lost*," *RES*, VII (1931), 333, regards the play as a "quite friendly burlesque," and observes. "But Shakespeare cannot intend to identify these students with a school of night or atheism, since the disputed phrase occurs in one of the King's speeches, and if the reading is correct he associates the school with dungeons and hell." To remove this difficulty, Miss Yates, *op cit*, p 9, suggests alternate identifications. "The studious young men in the play can be interpreted as representing either the Raleigh group, immersed in their studies, or the Essex-Southampton group who laugh at schemes of that kind."

TWO GAELIC VARIANTS OF "THE TWO SISTERS"

Since undertaking, in 1938, a historical-geographical study of "The Two Sisters,"¹ I have acquired, from various sources, an imposing number of texts and tunes of this ballad—English, Scottish, Welsh, Irish, Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, Faroic, Icelandic, and American.² Besides these, there are in my files also many analogues of the ballad story (some in verse, others in prose) from Greece, Hungary, Poland, Lithuania, Finland, and other countries.

Of all the variants and analogues in my possession, none are more interesting, in either form or content, than the Gaelic texts here presented. Both were sent me by Miss Annie Johnson (Anna Nic Iain), of the Isle of Barra, the Hebrides, in 1939. Miss Johnson's own text, which I call *A*, was obtained from her mother last year. The *story* is still current in Barra, but of the song only fragments remain.³ Text *B* is from the manuscript collection of Keith Norman Macdonald.⁴

A

A Bhean Iadaich

A bhean ud thall hug o,	O woman over yonder, hug o,
Noch truagh leat mise hug o	Art thou not sorry for me
Air sgeir mhara hao ri hui o	On a sea-rock
Nochd 'gam bhathadh hug o	Tonight a-drowning,

¹ This is being written as a doctoral dissertation, under the direction of Professor Stith Thompson, of Indiana University.

² I have now approximately 350 texts and 125 tunes

³ Miss Johnson writes: "The story here tells of two sisters who were in love with the same man. One of the sisters, the younger, was his favourite, but the older sister was determined that he should be hers. The younger sister expected a child, and when the older one discovered her secret, she enticed her down to the shore to gather dulse, as she had a craving (due to her condition) for this delicacy. While at the shore, as they were both sitting on a little rock, dry at ebbtide, the older one began to comb her sister's hair, and the younger one, overcome by a drowsiness, fell asleep with her head on her sister's lap. Then the sister wove her hair into a plait with the seaweed on the rock and left her there. When she awoke, she was surrounded by the incoming tide, and bound to the rock by the hair of her head."

⁴ I have been unable to obtain from Miss Johnson any information regarding this collection except that it is in manuscript. Presumably it is still in the possession of the collector.

Air sgeir mhara hug o
 Nochd 'gam bhathadh hug o
 Miann an duilsg hao ri hui o
 Thug do'n traigh mi hug o

Miann an duilsg hug o
 Thug do'n traigh mi hug o
 'Si bhean radaich hao ri hui o
 Rinn mo thaladh hug o

'Se bhean radaich hug o
 Rinn mo thaladh hug o
 'S a dh'fhag mise hao ri hui o
 'N cois na traghaid hug o

'S a dh'fhag mise hug o
 'N cois na traghaid hug o
 'S i mo phuithar hao ri hui o
 Rinn mo bhathadh hug o

Se mo phuithar hug o
 Rinn mo bhathadh hug o
 Ceil e, ceil e hao ri hui o
 Air no mhathair hug o

On a sea-rock
 Tonight a-drowning?
 It was the desire for dulse
 Took me shorewards

The desire for dulse
 Took me shorewards,
 The jealous woman
 Me enticed

The jealous woman
 Me enticed,
 And left me here
 At the wave-mouth,⁵

And left me here
 At the wave-mouth,
 'Twas my sister
 Caused my drowning

'Twas my sister
 Caused my drowning;
 Hide it, hide it
 From my mother

l - s	f m . - r	r f -	l -
A bhean ud	thall	hug	o
l - s	f m : - r	r f -	l s -
Noch truagh	leat mise	hug	o
l d	r - m	l d'	m m -
Air sgeir	mhara	hao ri	hui o
			Nochd 'gam
l : - r	d d . l		
bhathadh	hug	o	

B

A' Bhean Eudach

Eilidh Chaileann hug o
 Cha b' e don-fhios hug o
 Thug an traigh mi hao ri ho ro
 Ach an t-ailgheas hug o

Thug an traigh mi hug o
 Ach an t-ailgheas hug o
 Miann an duilsg hao ri ho ro
 Thug an traigh mi hug o

Helen Calin hug o
 It was not ill tidings
 That took me shorewards,
 But inclination,
 Took me shorewards
 But inclination
 The desire for dulse
 Took me to the shore

⁵ Lit. *beside the shore*.

Miann an duilg hug o	The desire for dulse
Thug an traigh mī hug o	Took me shorewards,
Thug gu sgeir mī hao rī ho ro	Led me to the rock
Noch dean traghadh hug o	Which will not ebb,
Thug gu sgeir mī hug o	Led me to the rock
Noch dean traghadh hug o	Which will not ebb,
'S a dh'fhag mise hao rī ho ro	And left me here
So gam bhathadh hug o	And me drowning ^a
A Bhean ud thall hug o	O woman yonder
An cois na traghadh hug o	Beside the strand,
Noch truagh leat fhein hao rī ho ro	Are you not sorry
Bean ga bhathadh hug o	For a drowning woman?
Cha truagh, cha truagh hug o	Not sorry, not sorry,
'S beag do chas dhìom hug o	Little pity have you for me
Sin do chas uat hug o	Stretch forth thy foot,
Thoir do lamh dhomh hug o	Give me thy hand
Feuch an dean mī hao rī ho ro	That I may try
Buille shnamhadh hug o	To swim a stroke
No sgod dhe d' bhreacan hug o	Or a corner of thy plaid
Ma 's e 's aill leat hug o	If thou prefer it
Theirig dhachaidh hug o	Hasten home,
Innis trath e hug o	Tell it early,
Ceil e, ceil e hao rī ho ro	Hide it, hide it
Air mo mhathair hug o	From my mother
Noch truagh leat fhein	Are you not sorry
Bean ga bathadh	For a woman drowned?

The curious "interlocking" of the stanzas, recalling the stichomythia in Greek bucolic poetry and early English drama,⁷ is explained by the fact that this ballad was long a favorite "waulking song."⁸ Miss Johnson writes of the form:

The interlocking of the stanzas is common to nearly all (in fact, I might say to *all*) the Hebridean Waulking Songs. I think the reason for it is quite understandable. They were sung as an accompaniment to labour, and

^a So in the translation sent me by Miss Johnson. The *agus* construction is not here present.

⁷ E. g. *Gorboduc*, *Tancred and Gismunda*, *The Spanish Tragedy*, and *Damon and Pythias*.

⁸ Waulking was not, however, peculiar to the Hebrides. It was practiced also in Scotland proper, in Ireland, and in many of the more northern counties of England—Cumberland, Yorkshire, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, Worcestershire, Warwickshire, Cheshire, and others.

as a large number of women took part, the time and rhythm must be strict, not a beat must be lost, and the singing of the last two lines of a stanza as the first two of the next gave the singer time and a clue to the following lines.⁹

It is interesting to note that Dr. Johnson first learned of the process of waulking during his trip through the Hebrides, and, remembering the catholicity of his interests, we may consider it not altogether unlikely that he witnessed the process in operation and heard, among other songs accompanying the work, the one here presented. As to that, however, we have no confirmation. Boswell tells us only that

Last night Lady Rasay shewed him the operation of wawking cloth, that is, thickening it in the same manner as is done by a mill. Here it is performed by women, who kneel upon the ground, and rub it with both their hands, singing an Erse song all the time.¹⁰

As will be noted, there is a marked contrast between the story of *A* and that of *B*. Both variants are obviously incomplete, and the parts lacking in the one are not always the same as those which have been lost from the other. Too, the events narrated do not always follow the same order in the two texts.

<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>
appeal to onlooker for sympathy reason for having gone to shore disclosure of jealous woman's trick identification of jealous woman as sister injunction not to tell mother	reason for having gone to shore appeal to onlooker for sympathy reproach by drowning woman appeals to onlooker for aid injunction not to tell mother

Is the "woman over younder" the murderess (i. e. the sister)? It would seem improbable that this is the case in *A*, since the sister is later referred to as "the jealous woman." However, the stanzas may be disordered. Possibly the first part of the ballad narrates the antecedent action and this is followed by a direct appeal to the sister.

The conclusion of *B*, with its threefold appeal for assistance, agrees rather closely with English versions, and there seems to be

⁹ From a letter of April 20, 1939.

¹⁰ *Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides with Dr. Johnson* (ed. Birkbeck Hill), v, 178.

little room for doubt that the "woman yonder" and the elder sister are one and the same, despite the fact that no mention is made of the latter.

Among all the texts I have examined there is only one other in which there is any indication of an illicit relationship between the lover and one of the sisters:

GED 4 He brought the second sheath and knife,
But the youngest was to be his wife.¹¹

However, the fact that it is the *second sister*, who is not mentioned again, lessens the significance of the relationship.

The injunction "Hide it, hide it From my mother," too, differs from the usual Anglo-Scottish ending:

GEC 26 O yonder sits my father, the king,
And yonder sits my mother, the queen

E² 21 And sune the harp sang loud and clear
"Fareweel, my father and mither dear"

A Swedish text contains a triplicate dying message to father, mother, and lover:

GS A 12 Helsa då hem till min fader god,
Jag dricker mitt bröllop i klaran flod.
13 Och helsa hem till min moder;
Jag dricker mitt bröllop i floden
14 Och helsa hem till min fasteman.
Min brudsang jag baddar på hvitan sand¹²

¹¹ Use of the figure of sheath and knife to symbolize sexual relations is well enough known to need no comment here. See, for other occurrences of it in balladry, "Leesome Brand" (Child, No 15), A 36-37 and B 12-13 and "Sheath and Knife" (Child, No. 16), A 8 The erotic symbolism of Child D is commented upon also in the late Phillips Barry's "The Psychopathology of Ballad-Singing" (*BFSSNE*, No 11 [1936], 17-18), with the reminder that traces of it occur in other Scottish texts as well

¹² See also GS G 17-19. A truncated form appears in a text from Swedish Finland, GSF B 12-13 (father and lover):

Halsa da hem till min fader god
jag dricker mitt bröllop i klara flod.
Och halsa da hem till min fasteman
Min brudsang jag baddar på viter sand

These messages resemble those to the mother in the Slavic folksong "Što Morava mutna teče" ("Why does the Morava flow so turbidly?"), which, however, is not an analogue.

The comb, like the harp, the rune, the "sleep thorn," the "hand of glory," and certain herbals, is a potent sleep-producer,¹³ and has, besides, other magic properties.¹⁴ In view of the frequent occurrence in balladry of combing as a mere convention, however, it may be that we have here simply a natural sleep induced by the combing, and not a magic slumber. On the other hand, the latter interpretation is appropriate to the situation and may well be the correct one, particularly so because of the apparent antiquity of the text and because of the fact that there appears to have been no contamination of it by other versions.

PAUL G. BREWSTER

University of Missouri

SHELLEY'S USE OF GRAY'S POETRY

One of Shelley's classmates at Eton, Walter S. Halliday, records that Shelley was very fond of Gray's *Elegy Written in a Country Church-yard*¹ Halliday's testimony may not be wholly reliable since he was writing more than fifty years later. But in 1808 or 1809 Shelley translated into Latin the epitaph at the end of the *Elegy* and in a letter to Godwin of 16 January 1812, he quoted two lines from the poem.

Why does the Morava flow so turbidly every evening? Are they watering the pasha's horses? Or is the pasha's army passing? They are not watering the pasha's horses, nor is the pasha's army passing. Two sisters, Emina and Fatima, were bathing. Fatima drowned, but Emina crossed the river in safety. The dead head spoke "Emina, my dear sister, do not tell our dear mother that I was drowned, but tell her that I was married. The fine sands are my wedding-guests, the crabs my best men, and the little fish my sisters-in-law. The black earth is my bed, a stone my pillow, and the clear sky my coverlet" (Text No. 11182 of the Parry Collection of Southslavic Folk Texts, Harvard University. This translation I owe to the kindness of Mr. Albert B. Lord.)

¹³ The motif of the combing is D1364.9 in Aarne-Thompson, *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature* (comb causes magic sleep). Cf. also Type 709 and Bolte-Polivka, *Anmerkungen zu den Kinder- u. Hausmärchen der Brüder Grimm*, I, 463.

¹⁴ E. g., in "Willie's Lady" (Child, No. 6), where the "kaims of care" are used by the wicked mother-in-law to prevent the birth of a child.

¹ T. J. Hogg, *The Life of Percy Bysshe Shelley* (London, 1858), I, 43.

In "Despair," one of the poems in *Original Poetry by Victor and Cazire*, the following lines,

He looks on all this world bestows,
The pride and pomp of power,
As trifles best for pageant shows
Which vanish in an hour, (21-24)

are clearly indebted for thought and phrase to the lines in the *Elegy*,

The Boast of Heraldry, the Pomp of Pow'r,
And all that Beauty, all that Wealth e'er gave,
Awaits alike th' inevitable Hour (33-35)

In the second canto of "The Wandering Jew," there are two lines which echo a passage that occurs only in the Eton MS of the *Elegy*

<i>Elegy</i> , Eton MS	"The Wandering Jew," II, 374-5
Bids ev'ry fierce tumultuous Pas- sion cease	Which bade each wild emotion cease, And hushed the passions into peace

A grateful Earnest of eternal Peace

In the *Elegy* Shelley found sentiments which may have helped him in composing some lines for *Queen Mab*.

<i>Elegy</i> , 47, 51-52	<i>Queen Mab</i> , v, 127-131
. the rod of empire .	The iron rod of Penury still compels
Chill Penury repress'd their noble	Her wretched slave to bow the knee
rage,	to wealth,
And froze the genial current of the	And poison, with unprofitable toil,
soul	A life too void of solace to confirm
	The very chains that bind him to
	his doom

<i>Elegy</i> , 57-60	<i>Queen Mab</i> , v, 137-146
Some village-Hampden, ² that with	How many a rustie Milton has
dauntless breast	passed by,
The little Tyrant of his fields with-	Stifing the speechless longings of
stood;	his heart,

² In the Eton MS, in place of Hampden, Milton, and Cromwell, Gray wrote Cato, Tully, and Caesar. The appearance of Cato in *Queen Mab*, together with the echo just pointed out in "The Wandering Jew," may indicate that Shelley was, in some manner, familiar with the readings of the Eton MS.

Some mute inglorious Milton here may rest, Some Cromwell guiltless of his country's blood	In unremitting drudgery and care! How many a vulgar Cato has com- pelled His energies, no longer tameless then, To mould a pin, or fabricate a nail! How many a Newton, to whose pas- sive ken Those mighty spheres that gem infinity Were only specks of tinsel, fixed in Heaven To light the midnights of his native town!
--	---

It should be observed that, while the dependence on Gray is unmistakable in these two parallels, Shelley does not follow the *Elegy* slavishly. On the sentiments expressed Shelley felt very strongly, and there was no necessity to plagiarize. The passages in the *Elegy* simply served as a source of inspiration for more extended utterance.

It seems unlikely, considering the small body of Gray's poetry, that Shelley could have been familiar with the *Elegy* and not with Gray's other poems. It is certain that by January, 1810, Shelley had read and had thoroughly assimilated two others, "The Fatal Sisters" and "The Descent of Odin." The influence of these two poems is unmistakable in "Ghasta, or, The Avenging Demon!!!", one of the poems in *Original Poetry by Victor and Cazire*. It has not hitherto been noticed that "Ghasta" contains a number of lines which were plagiarized from "The Fatal Sisters" and "The Descent of Odin." Shelley's use of "The Fatal Sisters" is comparatively simple:

"The Fatal Sisters," 49-50, 57: Horror covers all the heath, Clouds of carnage blot the sun. . . . Mortal, thou that hear'st the tale . . .	"Ghasta," 5-6; 37 Horror covers all the sky, Clouds of darkness blot the moon . . . Mortal, thou that saw'st the sprite . . .
--	--

From "The Descent of Odin" Shelley took lines which he used not only in "Ghasta" but also in "The Wandering Jew" and in his second novel, *St. Irvyne*. "Ghasta," indeed, bears more than

verbal similarity to "The Descent of Odin." In both poems a powerful person calls up spirits of the dead to answer questions, but as this situation is to be found also in *The Monk*³ we cannot insist on Shelley's having taken it from Gray's poem. In both "Ghastia" and "The Descent of Odin" dialogue is presented in dramatic form—a form which Shelley used in the incantation scenes of "The Wandering Jew."

"The Descent of Odin" provided Shelley with two lines which he used over and over again:

Till wrap'd in flames, in ruin hurl'd,
Sinks the fabric of the world (93-4)

In "Ghastia" these lines, with slight changes, are alternated with two lines from *The Monk*,⁴ and it is probably for this reason that they have remained unnoticed. The passage in "Ghastia" reads:

Thou art mine and I am thine,
'Till the sinking of the world,
I am thine and thou art mine,
'Till in ruin death is hurled— (73-6)

In "The Wandering Jew" Shelley uses the thought suggested by Gray's lines no less than five times. The words are varied in each instance, but Gray's influence is indisputable, nevertheless:

. . . till this earthly frame
Sinks convulsed in bickering flame— (I, 262-3)
I thy friend, till this fabric of earth
Sinks in the chaos that gave it birth . . . (I, 298-9)
Or, into the gulf impetuous hurled
If sinks with its latest tenants the world . . . (I, 310-311)
Till, in latest ruin hurled,
And fate's destruction, sinks the world' (III, 861-2)
When this globe calcined by the fury of God
Shall sink beneath his wrathful nod!— (III, 869-70)

Again, in *St. Irvyne* we find Wolfstein swearing eternal love for Megalena, they will seek each other, he says, "when, convulsed by nature's latest ruin, sinks the fabric of this perishable globe."⁵

³ M. G. Lewis, *The Monk*, ed. E. A. Baker (London, 1929), chap. iv, pp. 134-6

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 122 and 126

⁵ *The Prose Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley*, ed. R. H. Shepherd (London, 1888), I, 147

In "The Descent of Odin" when the prophetic Maid penetrates Odin's disguise, she says,

King of Men, I know thee now,
Mightiest of a mighty line— (82-3)

These lines must have been in Shelley's mind when he wrote in "Ghastly" the lines,

Mighty one I know thee now,
Mightiest power of the sky . . . (169-170)

It may be significant that none of Shelley's first-rate poetry reveals any influence of Gray. The lines he borrowed from Gray were admirably suited to the nature of his early poetry, but after *Queen Mab* his interest in Gray seems to have trailed off ignominiously. On the title-page of *A Refutation of Deism* (1814) there occurs the word "ΣΥΝΕΤΟΙΣΙΝ,"⁶ which Shelley may have found on the title-page of Gray's *Odes*, and in a letter to Keats in 1820, speaking about "The Cenci," Shelley quoted line 123 from "The Progress of Poesy":

"Below the good how far! but far above the great"

FRANCIS J. GLASHEEN

*State Teachers College
Danbury, Connecticut*

ANOTHER READING OF *THE TURN OF THE SCREW*

Henry James himself claimed for *The Turn of the Screw* only the right to be considered "a piece of ingenuity pure and simple, of cold artistic calculation, an *amulette* to catch those not easily caught . . . , the jaded, the disillusioned, the fastidious."¹ Yet those not easily caught have been unable to shake off the impression that there is in this story much more than an amusing novelette. Students of James know, of course, that his interest in any series of incidents was confined neither to their dramatic value nor to their realistic impact, but rather to their potentialities as artistic

⁶ Pindar, *Olymp* II, 85.

¹ *The Novels and Tales of Henry James* (New York, 1917), Preface, XII, xviii.

pattern, and that, for him, a story lay not in mere physical plot, but in the undercurrent of suggestion and implication. Like Edmund Wilson, most of us cannot remember that James ever wrote a story "which did not have a more or less serious point,"² and, like Wilson, we feel that *The Turn of the Screw* is more than a ghost story. What, however, that "more" is constitutes a problem of interpretation. Is *The Turn of the Screw*, as Mr. Wilson believes, "a study in morbid psychology" and are the ghosts "merely the governess's hallucinations?"

I

The danger in the psychoanalytic method of criticism lies in its apparent plausibility. To Mr. Wilson, for instance, the young governess who narrates the story of *The Turn of the Screw* is "a neurotic case of sex repression." And that, from a psychoanalytic point of view, is a plausible hypothesis. The daughter of a poor country parson, she has fallen in love with the children's guardian, "a bachelor in the prime of life," eligible and charming. Alone with her young charges, she wanders about the estate thinking of its master and thus comes upon the ghost of Quint, the valet, who is wearing the master's smart clothes. Quint, in Wilson's theory, "has been ambiguously confused"—in the governess's mind—"with the master and with the master's interest in her."³

Mr. Wilson is less clear about the symbolism of Miss Jessel's ghost. The former governess had apparently had an affair with Quint and had been an accomplice in corrupting the children. "Observe," says Wilson, "from the Freudian point of view, the significance of the governess's interest in the little girl's pieces of wood and of the fact that the male apparition first appears on a tower and the female apparition on a lake."⁴ These hints, however, fail to explain Miss Jessel's symbolic necessity in James's

² "The Ambiguity of Henry James," *Hound and Horn*, vii (April: June, 1934), 391

³ *Ibid.*, p. 388.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 387. Apropos the implied interpretation of the last "fact," some irreverent wag in Washington, D. C., has observed that the monuments to George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, in our National capital, suggest, in Freudian symbolism, that Washington was the father and Lincoln the mother of our country.

Freudian pattern, and Wilson wisely drops her completely and devotes himself to Quint and his influence on little Miles.

The trouble with Wilson's interpretation—and Miss Edna Kenton's (to whose theory Mr. Wilson acknowledges indebtedness)—is that, although it may carry an air of plausibility, it clearly has no relation to James's intention. Mr. Wilson is, presumably, aware of the fact that Freudian psychology was something Henry James could not have been conscious of dealing with, he therefore places *The Turn of the Screw*, along with *Moby Dick* and the *Alice* books, among the "small group of fairy tales whose symbols exert a peculiar power by reason of the fact that they have behind them, *whether or not the authors are aware of it*, a profound grasp of subconscious processes."⁵ But by the same method it is possible to build up an excellent case for a Freudian interpretation of *Hamlet*, and surely that would not be reflective of Shakespeare's intention. Although it might be an interesting disclosure of the workings of the psychoanalyst's mind, it would tell us little or nothing about Shakespeare's. *The Turn of the Screw*, if read as Edmund Wilson reads it, becomes orthodox James Joyce or D. H. Lawrence; it ceases to be Henry James. Wilson fails to take advantage of much that we know of James's life, personality, and concepts and methods of art. In the light of this knowledge it is possible to read *The Turn of the Screw* more simply and, it seems to this writer, more convincingly.

II

In a consideration of James's "Ethics," Professor Joseph Warren Beach came to the conclusion that James "may not be American as Mark Twain or Benjamin Franklin or Edgar Lee Masters are American, but he is American as Emerson and Thoreau and Hawthorne are."⁶ James's Americanism is, just now, not our concern, but any one who has read James carefully, especially his *Hawthorne*, cannot help feeling that his kinship with the Puritan and transcendental traditions is, at least as it affected his artistic attitude, much closer than it might appear on the surface. Rebecca

⁵ *Ibid*, pp 390-391 The italics are mine.

⁶ *The Method of Henry James* (New Haven and London, 1918), p. 144.

West⁷ and Cornelia Pulsifer Kelley⁸ have shown the influence of Hawthorne on James's artistic development. James admired Hawthorne and thought him "the most valuable example of the American genius."⁹ One of the things in Hawthorne he singled out for special praise was his preoccupation with sin, which, James noted, "seems to exist" in Hawthorne's mind "merely for an artistic purpose . . . He played with it and used it as a pigment; he treated it, as the metaphysicians say, objectively. . . . It was a necessary condition for a man of Hawthorne's stock that if his imagination should take license to amuse itself, it should at least select this grim precinct of the Puritan morality for its playground." Another thing he approved of was the formative influence on Hawthorne of *Pilgrim's Progress* and the *Faery Queen*. "A boy," he writes, "may have worse company than Bunyan and Spenser. . . ." ¹⁰

Why then inject Freud into the interpretation of a story by James when it is obvious that the tradition represented by Hawthorne furnishes a more likely clue? *The Turn of the Screw* is a simple allegory of the type which fascinated Hawthorne. To be sure, James considered allegory as "one of the lighter exercises of the imagination." He admitted that "Many excellent judges have a great stomach for it, they delight in symbols and correspondences, in seeing a story told as if it were another and a very different story." For himself, however, he confessed deriving "but little enjoyment of it," not being able to consider it "a first rate literary form." Yet he was willing to grant that "It has produced assuredly some first-rate works, and," he added, "Hawthorne in his younger years had been a great reader and devotee of Bunyan and Spenser, the great masters of allegory." He singled out for approval the kind of allegory which is "extremely spontaneous, when the analogy presents itself with eager promptitude."¹¹ Two things are important to add in this connection. One is that James never valued *The Turn of the Screw* higher than as "one of the lighter exercises

⁷ *Henry James* (New York, 1916), p. 250.

⁸ *The Early Development of Henry James* (Urbana, 1930). See especially pp. 18, 22, 251-5.

⁹ *Hawthorne* (London, 1879), p. 2.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 62-63.

of the imagination."¹² The other is that the analogy in the tale "presents itself with eager promptitude."

III

In simple terms, *The Turn of the Screw* is an allegory which dramatizes the conflict between Good and Evil. The apparitions are the personifications of evil, they are like Emerson's dead men's thoughts by which we permit ourselves to be guided, and like Ibsen's ghosts which come to haunt Mrs. Alving. The governess, the parson's daughter, is a sort of Guardian Angel, hovering protectingly over the two innocent children placed in her charge.

Read this way, the numerous hints throughout the story become significant and fall into the pattern. Perhaps even the names of the characters may have been selected with conscious aptness: Miles, the little show-off, who seizes every opportunity to flaunt the "badness" that is within him, Flora, part lovely flower and part wanton weed, Mrs. Grose, a simple, illiterate, undiscerning person. But it is not important to stress this point.¹³ The governess herself has no name: she's merely a point of view, that of a clergyman's daughter, for whom Evil would have strong and sinister power. Both children are outwardly angelically beautiful. How could they be corrupt? Yet Quint dominates the tower of their home, Quint who has red hair and red whiskers, the conventional guise of the Devil. The children want to get to the two horrors. "But for what?" asks the good and simple Mrs. Grose. "For the love of all the evil that . . . the pair put into them," says the governess. "And to ply them with that evil still, to keep up the work of demons, is what brings the others back."

All this is reminiscent of Hawthorne, of "Young Goodman Brown" and "Rappaccini's Daughter." And, indeed, these two stories were pronounced by James as "little masterpieces"; they were, in his opinion, representative of "the highest point that

¹² See his letter to F. W. H. Myers "The *T of the S* is a very mechanical matter, I honestly think—an inferior, a merely *pictorial*, subject and rather a shameless pot-boiler." *The Letters of Henry James*, ed. Percy Lubbock (New York, 1920), I, 300

¹³ It is interesting to note, however, that in a later article, Edmund Wilson remarks that James's idealism "appears in the name of the hero of *The American Newman*" "*The Last Phase of Henry James*," *Partisan Review*, IV (February, 1938), p. 5.

Hawthorne reached" in the field of fantasy and allegory.¹⁴ The purposes for which Quint seeks to meet little Miles are the same old purposes for which the Devil met young Goodman Brown in the woods near Salem. And little Flora is another Beatrice Rappaccini, outwardly marvelously beautiful, but inwardly corrupted by the poison of evil. Miss Jessel's rôle in the story is, of course, the same as that of Quint, although her inclusion at all is probably due to James's sense of artistic balance.¹⁵ Miss Jessel is to Flora what Quint is to Miles; each is a corrupting influence: and each helps to complicate and thicken the texture of a capital story—which is what *The Turn of the Screw* set out primarily to be; it is an allegory only secondarily. The rôles of the uncle and Mrs. Grose have less significance, primarily they help the physical story, secondarily, they represent lack of vigilance, nay, indifference (especially the uncle) to the possibilities of evil.

It is logical for the governess to be tempted to run away from it all, but Duty keeps her on the spot, fighting for the souls of her charges. It is almost as if Hawthorne's Salem ancestors were writing about little Flora: "She was not at these times a child, but an old, old woman." Evil is old. After Mrs. Grose finally takes Flora away, the governess remains with Miles to extract his confession. "If he confesses," she says, "he's saved." But he doesn't confess—entirely. For just then Quint appears to make his last stand against the governess. As soon as Miles admits that he took the letter Quint disappears and "the air is clear again." Just as Miles is about to confess what things he had said at school Quint reappears, "as if to blight his [Miles's] confession and stay his answer." In the end the Agent of Good is almost successful, but little Miles is dead, like Beatrice Rappaccini, exhausted by the ordeal. "Frightened to death," says Edmund Wilson. More likely too corrupted to live without evil, like the beautiful wife in Hawthorne's "The Birthmark," whose husband, a surgeon, removed the one blemish to her perfect beauty, only to find that it was imbedded in her heart.

¹⁴ Hawthorne, p. 56

¹⁵ Note, for example, "The Private Life," the story of Clare Vawdrey, a person who has no creative public life. This fictive thread is complicated and balanced by another, relating to Lord Mellifont, who exists only in public.

IV

It is possible, of course, that we have read into this novelette more than its author intended it to convey. Perhaps it is really nothing but "a shameless pot-boiler" and our readings of it are merely fanciful? "I am only afraid," wrote James to Dr. Louis Waldstein, "that my conscious intention strikes you as having been larger than I deserve it should be thought." And yet, a little later, "*But*, of course, where there is life, there's truth, and the truth was at the back of my head."¹⁶ What was at the back of James's head is worth surmising, in the light of what we know of his ideas, his preoccupations, his methods, and, above all, the literary influences he acknowledged. This is not the same thing as surmising "subconscious processes" in the light of Freud.

N. BRYLLION FAGIN

The Johns Hopkins University

MECHANICAL FEATURES OF A SEVENTEENTH CENTURY SUBMARINE

The submarine, now a dominant factor in twentieth century warfare, owes its success to modern machinery and inventive genius. The idea of underwater travel has been handed down to us through centuries and even thousands of years in the stories of Jonah, Triton and his dolphins, Neptune, and mermaids. About the end of the fifteenth century, Leonardo da Vinci made a more practical suggestion for a means of submarine navigation than by the use of whales and dolphins, but it was not until the early part of the seventeenth century that an underwater craft was successfully constructed. In 1624 one Cornelius Van Drebel built a submarine which is said to have carried King James of England as a passenger under the surface of the River Thames.

In 1625 Ben Jonson produced a play *The Staple of News* which reviewed the outstanding events of the day much as the modern columnist does in our daily newspapers, and in one scene the characters comment on Van Drebel and his submarine.¹

¹⁶ *Letters*, I, 297.

¹ Ben Jonson, *The Staple of News*. London. Printed by I. B. for Robert Allot, 1631. Act III, sc. ii, p. 40.

Thomas—They write here one *Cornelius-Son*,
 Hath made the *Hollanders* an inuisible *Eele*,
 To swimme the Hauen at Dunkirke, and sinke all
 The shipping there.

Peniboy, Iv —But how is't done?

Cymbal—I'll shew you, Sit (sic)
 It is an *Automa*, runnes vnder water,
 With a snug nose, and has a nimble taile
 Made like an *auger*, with which taile she wrigles
 Betwixt the coasts of a Ship, and sinke it stieght.

P Iv —Whence ha'you this *newes*?

Fitton—From a right hand, I assure you,
 The *Eele*-boats here, that lye before Queen-Hyth,
 Came out of *Holland*

P Iv.—A most braue deuice,
 To murder their flat bottomes.

Several modern writers have noticed Jonson's account of this ancestor of the modern U-Boat. Richard Edgecumbe,² commenting on Jonson's reference to the "Eele Boats," seems to take for granted that the apparatus under discussion is a torpedo. "... Although the use of torpedoes in naval warfare was proposed in the early part of the nineteenth century, no successful application of them was made until the American Civil War of 1861-4." Mr. Edgecumbe does not comment on the fact that in Jonson's play the contrivance is classed as a boat nor does he seem to be cognizant of Van Drebel as a historical figure.

Frederick A. Pottle³ shows that about the same year as the appearance of Jonson's play, one William Drummond of Hawthornden was granted a letter of patent for a boat which might have inspired Jonson's "invisible eel." Mr. Pottle, without taking into account Van Drebel and his submarine, investigates the possibility that Jonson may have been satirizing Drummond's invention.

The most recent writer to quote the "submarine" passage from Jonson's *The Staple of News* is John Lepper.⁴ Mr Lepper says, "The Cornelius referred to in the dialogue above was a Dutchman known as Cornelius Debrell or Drebbel, who appears to have

² Richard Edgecumbe, "Torpedoes," *Notes and Queries*, 10th ser, v. 1 (April 9, 1904), p. 286.

³ Frederick A. Pottle, "Two Notes on Ben Jonson's *Staple of News*," *Modern Language Notes*, vol. XL (1925), pp 223-6

⁴ John Lepper, "Ancestors of the U-Boat," *The Nineteenth Century and After*, vol. CXXVI (1939), pp 560-564.

actually constructed a sort of primitive submarine in which King James I of England made a trial voyage on the Thames. *Little is known of the principle by which it was operated.*" (The italics are mine.) As far as can be ascertained every mention of Van Drebel's submarine stresses the lack of information concerning its construction. However, by examining the individual words in Jonson's account of this early 17th century submarine a plausible picture of several of its features can be reconstructed.

In the first place it is remarked that the vessel "runs under water" and is to be used as a war vessel for it is to "sink all the shipping" at Dunkirk. The boat is called an "automa" (an erroneous form of "automaton") which implied that it was capable of self-movement by means of a "nimble tail made like an auger." On the face of it this could only be a description of an Archimedean screw (propellor). "Nimble" would imply active movement and "like an auger" clearly suggests spiral rotation. This might seem to anticipate Ericsson's screw propellor by some two hundred years, but it is difficult to conceive any other interpretation of Jonson's description of the "eel's tail." The Archimedean screw had, of course, been known for centuries. The motive power could easily have been supplied by human muscles.

The NED. gives Jonson's use of *snug* as the sole quotation illustrating *snug*, a² defining it as "?snub," with the reference [cf. *snug*, sb. 1]. *Snug*, sb. 1, is in turn defined as "a rugged projection, a hard knob or knot, a snag." The NED. illustrates this with a quotation dated 1665. Coupled with the rest of Jonson's description of Von Drebbel's submarine it would appear then that the vessel "with a snug nose" was in reality equipped with a ram. This is further borne out by the statement that "she wrigles betwixt the coasts (ribs) of a Ship, and sinks it streight."

J. LOUIS KUETHE

The Johns Hopkins University Library

CHAUCER'S TWO-MILE PILGRIMAGE

Of Decembre the tenthe day,
 Whan hit was nyght, to slepe I lay
 Ryght ther as I was wont to done,
 And fil on slepe wonder sone,
 As he that wery was forgo
 On pilgrymage myles two
 To the corseynt Leonard,
 To make lythe of that was hard

(*Hous of Fame*, 111-118)

This passage is usually interpreted somewhat as follows: "On the tenth of December, when it was night, I lay down and fell asleep wonderfully soon, as one who was overwearied by walking a pilgrimage of two miles to St. Leonard [patron of prisoners] ¹ for the purpose of making soft (or easy) that which was formerly hard [namely, the bonds of matrimony]." ² Skeat has pointed out a source of the allusion to St. Leonard: Jean de Meun, in the *Roman de la Rose*, says in effect that "Marriage is an evil bond—so may St. Leonard aid me, who frees repentant prisoners from their fetters." ³

The phrase "myles two," however, has no prototype in Jean de Meun. One wonders exactly what it signifies—why a pilgrimage of *two miles* to the "corseynt Leonard?" The phrase is probably not a rhyme-tag, for the expression "forgo" with which it rhymes is very rare if not unique, and thus likely itself to be a tag. ⁴ Skeat endeavors to explain the wearying two-mile pilgrimage as follows: "The difficulty was not in the walking two miles, but in doing so under difficulties, such as going barefoot for penance." O. F. Emerson, on the other hand, comments: "Note . . . the humorous reference to a pilgrimage of two miles as making anyone

¹ ME "Corseynt" seems often to have meant only "saint." The tomb of St. Leonard is near Limoges. St. Leonard's day is 6 Nov

² See Skeat's *Works of Chaucer*, III, 248 f., and Robinson's *Complete Works of Chaucer*, pp. 888 f.

³ See Skeat, as cited, and *Le Roman de la Rose*, ed Ernest Langlois (Soc. des anc. Textes français, Paris, 1914-26), vol III, II 8833-8838 and notes.

⁴ See Robinson, as cited

weary.”⁵ I should like to point out a possible interpretation which I believe has not been hitherto suggested.

The *House of Fame* was certainly written during the period of Chaucer's residence above Aldgate (that is, between 1374-1386)—concerning this there is no dispute. Now St. Leonard's, Foster Lane; St. Leonard's, Milkchurch; and St. Leonard's, Shoreditch, are all less than a mile from Aldgate; furthermore, Chaucer is not known to have had any connection with any of them. But the remaining St. Leonard's in the region of London was St. Leonard's nunnery of Stratford-atte-Bowe.⁶ This was two miles and a fraction from Aldgate—nearly, but not quite, three miles.⁷ Chaucer's relationship to Mme. Eglentyne's convent is well known, thanks to the admirable discussion of the Prioress in *Some New Light on Chaucer* by the lamented Dr. John Matthews Manly.⁸ In all likelihood, Chaucer visited Stratford-atte-Bowe in 1356, in the retinue of Countess Elizabeth of Ulster and her husband, Prince Lionel. The latter's aunt, Elizabeth of Hainaut, sister of Queen Philippa, resided in the nunnery, probably for twenty or more years, and died there in 1375. Certain traits of Chaucer's Prioress, and probably her name itself, may indicate that Chaucer was well acquainted with the personages of the convent.

I would suggest, then, that in *HF* 115-118 Chaucer localized a figure borrowed from Jean de Meun. The true purport of the allusion would probably have been clear only to Chaucer's circle.

⁵ [Selected] *Poems of Chaucer* (New York, 1911), p. 151.

⁶ On these various establishments dedicated to St. Leonard, see Stowe's *Survey*, ed. C. L. Kingsford (Oxford, 1908), I, 31, 166, 212, 304, 306; II, 74 f, 139, 141 f, 312, 369; William Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum A History of Abbeys*, etc. (London, 1848), IV, 119; Brayley, Brewer and Nightingale, *A Topographical and Historical Description of London and Middlesex* (London, 1816), V, 287 ff; George Hennessey, *Novum Repertorium Ecclesiasticum Parochiale Londinense* (London, 1898), pp. 81, 114, 126, 392, 466, and the London County Council *Register of the Committee for the Survey of the Memorials of Greater London* (London, 1900), I, 3, 11. Some portions of the walls of the original chapel of the nunnery of Stratford-atte-Bowe are incorporated in the present parish church of Bromley, Mx. This church is near the junction of Bromley High Street and St. Leonard's Street. Presumably the nunnery lay on the south side of the chapel, bordering Priory Street.

⁷ Chaucer's mile was the same as ours, so far as I can tell.

⁸ New York, 1926, pp. 202-220.

Indeed, many a baffled reader of the *Hous of Fame* must have suspected that the poem as a whole, with its cryptic double reference to "the tenth day of December," may have celebrated some occasion or event of so local a nature and such slight historical importance as to have sunk completely out of knowledge.

H. M. SMYSER

Connecticut College

THE AUTHORSHIP OF *WHITEHALL* (1827)

One of the most devious of the light-hearted contributors to *Blackwood's Magazine* in its salad days during the 1820's was Dr. William Maginn, the lively and versatile Irishman who was later to become the first editor of *Fraser's Magazine*. Most of Maginn's talents were dissipated in ephemeral periodical-writing; in fact, though he lived by his pen for nearly twenty years, he is usually credited with only one published volume, *Whitehall; or, the Days of George IV.*

Whitehall, which appeared anonymously in 1827, was primarily a parody on the contemporary second-rate historical novel, but it contained incidental burlesques of many other literary forms. Nor did it confine itself to parody; for, though it was presented as a volume published in "Yankeedoodoolia" in the year 2227, its setting was London in 1827, and it satirized many of the bigwigs of the period by name. Even the Duke of Wellington was not immune; he was discovered by the hero, a high-minded mulatto named John Jeremy Smithers, remorsefully addressing a statue of Napoleon and finding solace in the charms of "la belle Harriette."

Members of the Blackwood circle felt little pride in authorship, they were fond of collaborating—and, because they often needed to be discreet, fonder of concealing their collaboration. But until recently no one thought of questioning Maginn's right to be considered sole author of *Whitehall*. Then Miss Miriam M. H. Thrall pointed out that a letter from William Blackwood to John Gibson Lockhart, reprinted in Mrs. Oliphant's *William Blackwood and His Sons*, bore definite evidence that Lockhart had collaborated with Maginn in the novel.¹ My examination of the correspondence

¹ Miriam M. H. Thrall, *Rebellious Fraser's*, New York, 1934, pp. 241-242

preserved in the files of William Blackwood and Sons, Ltd., in Edinburgh, has brought forth two bits of evidence which not only confirm Miss Thrall's conclusions but also suggest the nature and extent of Lockhart's share in *Whitehall*.

The letter cited by Miss Thrall is obviously a reply to the letter of April 5, 1827, in which Lockhart wrote Blackwood. "I hope the enclosed *jeu desprit* will not be too strong for you. You must father it on the doctor if you print it." The nature of the "*jeu desprit*" is obvious from the following note, which is appended to Lockhart's letter and which was apparently intended as a preface to the article enclosed.

To C[hristopher]. N[orth] Esq
private & confidential

Dear North

I enclose you a small specimen of the historical Romance of West Indian Literature *anno domini* 2027 Put a proper dedication to Scott, Galt, Lauderdale, Blessington, Horace Smith, Hogg, or any other friend in the line whom you wish to gratify & believe me ever very truly yours

Morgan O'Doherty

Blue Posts
Cork Street
April 5, 1827

Lockhart's description certainly fits *Whitehall*.² His desire to "father it on the doctor" is understandable, for, as son-in-law of Sir Walter Scott and editor of the staid *Quarterly Review*, he could hardly afford to compromise himself by a trifling burlesque of the historical novel. Maginn was by 1827 commonly—though often erroneously—identified with Morgan O'Doherty, the quixotic Irish member of the fictitious inner circle of *Blackwood's*, and any article so signed would have been automatically credited to him.

Blackwood found the paper unacceptable—because he too had no

For the complete text of the letter, see Margaret Olphant's *Annals of a Publishing House: William Blackwood and His Sons* (Edinburgh and London, 1897), I, 244-245 Blackwood's praise of Wellington's address to the statue of Napoleon indicates, as Miss Thrall points out, that that portion of the novel was by Lockhart

² Although the novel was set in London, it was "West Indian" to the extent that the hero was a native of Jamaica and was accompanied by a slave named Caesar. The supposititious date of Lockhart's sketch was apparently two hundred years earlier than that of the finished novel, but the pseudo-historical approach was undoubtedly the same in both.

desire to offend Sir Walter—and evidently returned it to the author. Then on May 24 Lockhart wrote back "I made a present of my *jeu-d'esprit* to the Doctor who tells me he has rewritten & concluded it in his own fashion & made a volume of it. All this is of course to yourself." Maginn likewise avoided the resentment of Scott and of the dignitaries satirized by name, by publishing his book anonymously and omitting all mention of O'Doherty.

Lockhart's second letter throws light on a matter which Miss Thrall interpreted as evidence that the authors were "aware of [the] faults" of *Whitehall* ³ the criticism of a "Quarterly Reviewer" (possibly Lockhart himself) that "the author has spoiled a laudable joke by wire-drawing it to 330 pages."⁴ One can better understand the reviewer's condescending attitude when one knows that the "laudable joke" was Lockhart's, the "wire-drawing," Maginn's.

RALPH M. WARDLE

Cornell University

Mlle DESJARDINS AND THE "APOLOGIE DU LUXE"

In his well-known work, *L'apologue du luxe au XVII^e siècle* et "*Le Mondain*" de Voltaire, M. André Morize traces to the libertine tradition and to Saint-Évremond in particular the doctrine of epicurean existence found in Voltaire's brief poem. For the other principal idea in *Le Mondain*—the economic theory of the usefulness of luxury—M. Morize finds no precedent earlier than Mandeville, who affirms the utility of vice and selfishness in organized society. A third and quite minor element in Voltaire's argument is the psychological explanation of austerity as a rationalization of unfulfillment (Voltaire: "nommer vertu ce qui fut pauvreté"), a point on which Saint-Évremond is more explicit: "A dire vrai, ces sortes de privations sont délicieuses: c'est donner une jouissance exquise à son esprit de ce que l'on dérobe à ses sens" (I, 167, quoted by Morize, p. 50).

An earlier example of the argument for luxury and against frugality is found in the novel *Les Exilés de la cour d'Auguste*, of Mlle Desjardins (Paris, Barbin, 1672), one of the most widely-

³ *Rebellious Fraser's*, p. 243.

⁴ *Quarterly Review*, XXXVII (1828), 87.

circulated and often-reprinted of her works.¹ The *mondains* are referred to by name and defended as the economic utilizers of the goods of the world, which would go to waste without them

Dites, s'il vous plaît, par quels argumens vous prétendez détruire la superbe, & la volupté des Mondains Par la raison, repit froidement Volumnius je n'ay besoin que d'elle pour opposer l'homme à la brute, & c'est sur elle que je me suis fondé Que trouvez-vous de dissolu dans le siècle, interrompis-je On y cherche à vivre commodément, & agreablement Ne doit-on pas aux Dieux, ce compte des biens qu'ils nous ont départis? Si vous aviez donné à l'un de vos domestiques quelques terres à faire valoir, luy sçauriez-vous bon gré d'en laisser la moitié en friche? Les hommes sont proprement les depositaires des productions de la nature. C'est pour eux qu'elle enfante chaque jour tant de choses diverses Il faut en user en creatures reconnoissantes La mer nous offre des poissons, il faut les faire pescher La terre nous donne des fruits, il faut les cueillir Chaque element, chaque saison, fournit à l'homme de quoy rendre la vie plus delicieuse Tout cela ne se fait point en vain²

More original and more interesting, however, is the continuation of the above passage, in which Mlle Desjardins analyses the unconscious motivation of abstinence and frugality with a degree of insight and perception far in advance over that of Saint-Évremond:

Qui est donc sage à vostre avis? interrompis-je Moy, repit gravement Volumnius, qui delivré des engagemens du monde, trouve en moy seul, mon repos, & ma felicité—Hé, vous appelez un vray repos . . . ce chagrin que vous venez d'étaler contre tous les hommes? L'humeur satyrique dont vous estes devoré vous peint l'univers sous des formes hydeuses & sur le pretexte d'une censure inutile vous altere incessamment contre le genre

¹ Barbin, two editions in 1672, one in 1675. Besson, Lyons, 1696 Paris, 1684, 1701 La Haye, 1700 Leyden, 1703 Eighteenth-century editions of Mlle Desjardins' *Œuvres complètes* all contain the work English translations in 1679, 1726, and 1729. The last French edition appeared as late as 1802 In M Mornet's investigation of the contents of 392 private libraries from 1750-1780, the works of Mlle Desjardins occur more often than those of any other seventeenth-century French author (*Les enseignements des bibliothèques privées, 1750-1780, RHL*, 1910, p 473)

² *Les Épilés de la cour d'Auguste*, ed. Paris, Barbin, 1675, p 271 The name Volumnius recalls Voltaire's "et des Consuls en us," of the *Défense du Mondain* The abbé de la Porte noticed the above passage and said of it "(Il) a tant de rapport avec l'*Anti-Mondain* de M de Voltaire, qu'on est porté à croire que c'est dans les écrits de Mme de Villedieu, que le Poete françois a puisé l'idée de cette petite pièce" (*Histoire Littéraire des femmes françoises*, Paris, 1769, II, 21) The abbé exaggerates the resemblance and confuses Voltaire's title with Piron's *Anti-Mondain* of 1738.

humain, tout cela, dis-je, mérite le nom de tranquillité? Non, Volumnius, vous n'êtes point tranquille, vous n'êtes qu'aveugle sur votre trouble intestin. La confiance que vous avez en votre sagesse, est une superbe plus blâmable, que celle dont vous accusez les Mondains, & les tendres plaisirs dont vous vous déclarez le persecuteur, n'ont point d'effets si dangereux que les échappées de votre censure. Vous êtes plus esclave de vos desirs, que le voluptueux dont vous vous dites le fleau, ne l'est des siens. C'est pour leur obéir que vous noircissez les actions les plus innocentes, & vous trouvez en cela votre volupté, comme un autre homme la rencontre dans la satisfaction de ses sens.

These ideas, and something in the manner and rhythm of their expression, recall the passage in Flaubert's *Tentation de Saint Antoine* in which St. Anthony's former pupil Hilaron inveighs against the old man's hypocritical austerity. Across a gap of nearly two hundred years, a master stylist re-echoes the thoughts of a minor seventeenth-century novelist.

Tu te privas de viandes, de vin, d'étuves, d'esclaves et d'honneurs, mais comme tu laisses ton imagination t'offrir des banquets, des parfums, des femmes nues et des foules applaudissantes! Ta chasteté n'est qu'une corruption plus subtile, et ce mépris du monde l'impuissance de ta haine contre lui!

Washington University

BRUCE A. MORRISSETTE

THE SOURCES OF THOMAS CORNEILLE'S *COMTESSE D'ORGUEIL*

Von Schack, the historian of the Spanish theater, has indicated *El Señor de noches buenas* by Alvaro Cubillo de Aragón as the source of Thomas Corneille's *Comtesse d'Orgueil*.¹ But as Professor Lancaster has pointed out,² it is obvious that the French playwright departs from this source in writing the last two acts of his comedy. It is the belief of the present writer that Corneille drew the material for acts IV and V of his play and some material for acts I-III from a second source, namely, Moreto's *El Lindo Don Diego*. This note proposes to prove this and to show in what proportions Corneille combined his material from both Spanish plays.

¹ Von Schack, *Geschichte der dramatischen Literatur und Kunst in Spanien*, Frankfurt, 1854, III, supplement, p. 104.

² *French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century*, III, 810.

Briefly, the action of *La Comtesse d'Orgueil* concerns the love intrigues of the Marquis de Lorgnac, an arrogant, egotistic, but well-to-do noble and his timid, impecunious brother, the Chevalier, whom he treats ignominiously. The latter has loved, for some time, Olimpe, the daughter of Anselme, but has not had the courage to declare his love to her. Somewhat naively, he confides his secret affection to his brother, hoping that the latter, in order to be rid of him, will foster it and help bring it to fruition. He begs the Marquis, then, to ask Anselme, in his behalf, for the hand of his daughter. As is to be expected, when the Marquis learns that Olimpe is beautiful and that her father is wealthy, he resolves to propose for himself. Anselme consents and both men sign a *dédt*. Through a misunderstanding, Olimpe believes the Chevalier to be the Marquis; but upon meeting the latter she is shocked by his behavior and, discovering her mistake, decides, by means fair or foul, to be rid of him and to marry instead the Chevalier. Toward this end, Carlin, the Chevalier's valet, and Virgine, Olimpe's maid, work out a clever scheme. Oronte, the suitor of Olimpe's cousin, Lucrèce, has a sister, the Comtesse d'Orgueil of Brittany, rich and widowed. As the latter is away on a trip, Virgine will impersonate her and endeavor to lure away the Marquis. Through Carlin, a meeting is arranged. The nobleman is quite impressed by the *soi-disant* countess and proposes marriage to her; he is accepted and decides to wed her the very next day. Reassured by Virgine that she will pay the *dédt*, he breaks his promise to Anselme. The latter agrees to marry his daughter to the Chevalier. The Marquis now proudly points to Olimpe's chambermaid as his spouse-to-be only to be informed that Virgine is truly a maid and that she will marry Carlin.

To be sure, the first three acts of the *Comtesse d'Orgueil* resemble in general acts I-II of the three-act Spanish comedy, *El Señor de noches buenas*.³ In this play, the Marqués Carlos is rich but stupid. It will be noted that he is not arrogant as is the Marquis of the French play. As in the latter, his less fortunate brother, Enrique, lacks a title and money and loves a girl whom he has admired for a long time, Porcia, daughter of the wealthy Marcelo. The action runs in the same manner as in the *Comtesse d'Orgueil*; that is, the Marqués is told by Enrique of his love and instead of proposing for his brother does so for himself; Porcia meets the Marqués, finds

³ I have used the B. A. E. edition of this comedy.

him to be repulsive, and resolves to marry not him but his brother. But the resemblance ceases here, for the means Porcia uses to bring this about are entirely different.

From this point on, Corneille uses the intrigues found in *El Lindo Don Diego* to bring about the dénouement of his play. In Moreto's three-act comedy ⁴ the emphasis is laid upon the coxcombriness of the principal character, Don Diego. The latter is a conceited fop whose vision is colored by the illusion that he is irresistible to women. This attitude inspires repugnance in all who know him. Corneille probably had this trait in mind when he created the Marquis.

Don Tello, uncle of this dandy, has two daughters, Inés and Leonor, whom he wishes to marry, respectively to his nephews, Diego and Mendo. The latter is suitable to Leonor, but Diego appears most unacceptable to Inés both because of his unbearable vainglory and because she loves Don Juan. A strong-willed girl, Inés determines to find a way out of so disagreeable a marriage as this one. To her aid come the two resourceful servants, Mosquito, a lackey in her father's service, and her maid, Beatriz. The plan is, of course, to entice Diego with what would seem to be a more flattering marriage and thus prevent him from marrying Inés. Now Don Juan has a cousin, a widowed countess, the *princesa de Bretaña*, who, for the moment, is away from the city. No sooner is this fact recalled than a scheme is worked out and Beatriz sallies forth as the Countess of Brittany.⁵ What follows we can easily surmise. Diego meets her, is dazzled by her beauty and affected speech, proposes and is accepted.

⁴ I have used the edition found in *Teatro escogido desde el siglo XVII*, vol. 4 (*Colección de los mejores autores españoles*, vol. 13), Paris, 1838.

⁵ In connection with the trick of having a maid impersonate a person of quality, I have examined Castro's *El Narciso en su opinión*, which probably influenced *El Lindo Don Diego*, and am convinced that if Th. Corneille knew this play he did not use it in writing *La Comtesse d'Orgueil*. Among the many marked differences, I find the following. (1) the noblewoman is neither a countess nor a widow, nor is she of Brittany; (2) though a maid impersonates her in order to embarrass a suitor, this noblewoman does appear on the stage, meets the suitor, and treats him with contempt; (3) Lucía, the maid, who does the impersonating, has not been dismissed by the father of her mistress, (4) unlike the Marquis of *La Comtesse d'Orgueil* and the Diego of Moreto's play the suitor of *El Narciso en su opinión* courts the disguised maid off-stage and we first see them together on the stage when she appears before him dressed as a maid and explains her appearance by saying that she was moved by jealousy to enter the employment of her rival.

Finally the day of reckoning arrives when, in the presence of all the actors, Diego, to everyone's relief and satisfaction, rejects his cousin's hand and announces his betrothal to Beatriz. The latter explains the ruse adding that she, for her part, will marry Mosquito. Inés, needless to say, will wed Juan; her sister, Mendo.

A count shows that out of thirty-four scenes twenty were influenced by *El Lindo Don Diego*, twelve by *El Señor de noches buenas*, and two by both plays. Two-thirds of the material for acts I-III is drawn from the latter comedy, which inspired fourteen of these scenes, whereas Moreto's comedy inspired six or one-third of them and all of acts IV-V. It is evident then from these proportions and from the above considerations that Moreto's play was the chief source of *La Comtesse d'Orgueil*, Cubillo de Aragon's the secondary one.

JOSEPH F. PRIVITERA

Saint Louis University

NATHANAEL SALMON ON MILTON, 1728

The first period of Milton criticism, during which varying degrees of abhorrence of the poet's career as politician accompanied the growing recognition of his genius, is said to have ended about 1730.¹ A comparatively late and hitherto overlooked example of this complex attitude is present in Nathanael Salmon's *History of Hertfordshire* (1728). Salmon's main contentions seem to be that Milton (1) intended, despite his incompatible political beliefs, to portray in Abdiel the "Character of a Cavalier," (2) was thereby guilty of insincerity, or worse, and (3) was driven to such unscrupulousness by "Poetical Fury," by the necessity of "keeping up to the Dignity of his Subject," and by sheer artistic competence. Inasmuch as Salmon himself suffered for his political convictions—he resigned his curacy rather than acknowledge Queen Anne as his sovereign and later, though facing poverty, refused to compound for another living—,² he was naturally prone in judging poets to emphasize their political loyalties.³

¹ John W. Good, *Studies in the Milton Tradition*, Urbana, Univ. of Illinois, 1913, p. 143.

² *DNB*.

³ Cf. the remarks on Denham in Salmon's *Antiquities of Surrey*, 1736, p. 169

The passage in the *Hertfordshire* reads.*⁴

This . . . Gentleman [one William Clerk of Graveley] lived in those Times when Estates and Integrity were at variance, and was *True as the Dial to the Sun*. He was one of those that had a Title to *Milton's* Character of a Cavalier, as I take it, under the Person of a Recusant Angel

[*Paradise Lost*, v, 896-907 quoted, beginning

So spake the Seraph Abdiel, faithful found . . .]

This Reading may require a little Comment to support it. The chief Difficulty lies in imagining this zealous *Antisalmatian* could dress up a Malignant in so amiable Colours. Let it be considered, that Poetical Fury hath chiefly in view an inimitable Piece: That Rocks, Tempests, Vulcanos, are all agreeable Sight from a masterly Hand. The Happiness of the Occasion, goes a great Way in the Happiness of the Description. This Protestor in a Convention of Rebel Angels, must lose some of the Beauties, unless we suppose him a Cavalier in Masque . . . I see no Absurdity in believing *Milton* furnished with a true Poetical *Apathia*, to chuse a Subject proper for the finest Drawing. That he had indeed so far debased his glorious Talents, and sunk his Mind from that superior Habitation, in which over-generous Nature had cantoned it, by a mercenary Application to the dirtiest of Work that he had arrived at as thorough an Aversion to an upright Angel, as an upright Man; that keeping up to the Dignity of his Subject was his only Aim, that if he had but Scope for a Performance that should be admired, even by those that detested his Memory, he could as *Virgil* or *Michael Angelo* draw indifferently a *Vulcan* or a *Venus*.

Salmon's appreciation of *Milton's* genius is as striking as his contempt for what he considers to be the poet's unscrupulousness. And Salmon is worthy of attention not merely as a link between *Milton* critics such as Wood and Burnet on the one hand and Johnson and Warburton on the other, but also as an early speculator on the nature of the poetic process.

ROBERT A. AUBIN

New Jersey College for Women

HOUSMAN'S *MORE POEMS*, VII AND DEHMEL'S *TROST*

An unusually close parallel exists between the first four lines of A. E. Housman's *More Poems*, VII and Richard Dehmel's *Trost*:

Stars, I have seen them fall,
But when they drop and die
No star is lost at all
From all that star-sown sky.

Du sahst eine Sternschnuppe fallen;
was hebst Du scheu die Hand?
Sieh, kein Stern verschwand.
alle leuchten noch allen.

* Page 185, col. 2.

Prof. Salinger's article in *MLN*.¹ mentioned the close parallel between one of Housman's poems and a poem of Heine, and a connection between Housman and other German poets seemed possible. This possibility seemed to me to be strengthened by Sparrow's article in *Nineteenth Century*² as well as by the fact that Richard Dehmel later translated a story by Housman's brother, Laurence, into German.³

It appears to be impossible, however, that there is any connection between the two poems, although each poet might have known the other's works, since they were contemporaries. Dehmel's *Trost* appears in the third edition of *Weib und Welt*, which makes up volume III of the edition of his collected works which appeared from 1906 to 1909. It appears in none of Dehmel's earlier books, and Frau Dehmel informs me that it was written only shortly before 1907, the date of publication of the third edition of *Weib und Welt*. Housman's *More Poems*, VII cannot be dated definitely, but from its position in the poet's notebooks⁴ it is apparent that it was written between August, 1893, and August, 1894. The poem, however, was not published until after Housman's death in 1936, and so it seems that there is no influence in either direction.

There is still the possibility of a common source, but this would be difficult to prove. Heine has the idea of a falling star in *Lyrisches Intermezzo*, 59:

Es fällt ein Stern herunter
aus seiner funkelnden Hoh'¹
Das ist der Stern der Liebe,
den ich dort fallen seh'.

Prof. Elster, in a note to this, points out that the theme is a common one in the folk-song, and is to be found also among the poems

¹ "Housman's *Last Poems*, XXX and Heine's *Lyrisches Intermezzo*, 62," *MLN*, LIV, 288.

² "Echoes in the Poetry of A. E. Housman," *Nineteenth Century*, CXY, 243.

³ *Blinde Liebe, eine Geschichte aus den höchsten Kreisen, sehr frei nach dem Englischen des Laurence Housman*. Berlin, 1912

⁴ Housman, Laurence *My Brother, A. E. Housman: Personal Recollections, Together with Thirty Hitherto Unpublished Poems* New York, 1938, p. 259

of Claudius and Brentano.⁵ The idea that although a star fell, "no star is lost," however, is peculiar to Housman and Dehmel.

EVERETT BUSHNELL GLADDING

The Johns Hopkins University

A NOTE ON CHATEAUBRIAND'S DOCUMENTARY ACCURACY

In his *Études critiques*,¹ M. Bédier gives William Bartram, *Voyage dans les parties sud de l'Amérique septentrionale*, I, 42-43 (trad. de l'anglais par P. V. Benoist, Paris, an IX), as the source for a description of the goldfish found in Chateaubriand's *Voyage en Amérique*, VI, 107-08 (ed. Ladvocat). After *une barre brune longitudinale traverse ses flancs*, M. Bédier refers to his footnote in which he states: "Cette barre brune longitudinale manque à la description de Bartram. exemple des *additions* promises par Chateaubriand."² This remark, which suggests Chateaubriand's infidelity to his source material, is misleading. It is due to Bédier's error in comparing the wrong description with Chateaubriand's. Bartram's description of the goldfish, cited below, is Chateaubriand's model:

La Dorade est, a-peu-près, de la grosseur d'un anchois. Elle a environ quatre pouces de long. Son corps est mince et allongé, sa tête est couverte d'un casque de bleu d'outremer. elle a le dos d'un brun rougeâtre, les côtés et le ventre de la couleur de feu, ou d'un beau rouge au minimum. Une bande noire et mince court le long de chaque côté, depuis les ouies jusqu'à la queue. Les yeux sont grands, l'iris est d'une couleur d'or brun.³

If this passage is compared with Chateaubriand's, it will be found that the French writer shortened, as it was his custom to do, rather than lengthened the description found in his source, and remained faithful, as usual, to all of the essential descriptive details.

T. C. WALKER

University of Tennessee

⁵ Heine, *Werke*, ed. Ernst Elster, I, 453.

¹ Paris, 1903, pp. 209-10.

² *Ibid.*, p. 210.

³ *Op. cit.*, I, 98-99.

REVIEWS

Early Middle English Literature. By R. M. WILSON. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd. [1939] Pp. 309. 8 s. 6 d.

For a long time there has been need for a book which one could recommend to students and readers interested in knowing something about the middle period of English literature. We have had in Professor Wells' *Manual* an indispensable work of reference, but it is not a book which the beginner can read for a survey of the period. Such general treatments as we have are all open to objections of one kind or another. Brandl's account in the first edition of Paul's *Grundriss* was of great significance in its day and is still a work which the scholar will disregard at his peril, but it has never been revised, and it has dropped out of subsequent editions of the *Grundriss*, and it is hard to get. Ten Brink's *History* is more successful in bringing out the larger aspects and developments of the period and can be had in English, but it presents so many views which were held by scholars sixty years ago and have since been abandoned or modified in important ways that it is safe only in the hands of one who already knows his way around in the subject. Jusserand's impressionistic sketch, Schofield's readable but badly proportioned and often superficial volume, Ker's stimulating and all too brief essay in the Home University Library—each of these books has its virtues but none is a history of Middle English literature.

We welcome, therefore, the present book. In it Mr. Wilson, who is Lecturer in English at the University of Leeds, has attempted to survey systematically and in the light of modern scholarship the literature of England in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. It is meant to be a popular handbook, intended for the general reader and the student rather than the specialist. After a consideration of the effect of the Norman Conquest there are chapters on Anglo-Latin and Anglo-French literature and one on "Legal and Historical Survivals." The fifth chapter brings us to "The Continuity of the Homiletic Tradition," in which the Lambeth and Trinity homilies and the Katherine group form the principal topics. A chapter each is next devoted to the *Ancren Riwle* and *The Owl and the Nightingale*, after which the treatment is by types: Religious and Didactic Literature, Romance, Tales and Fables, Lyric Poetry, The Beginnings of the Drama. A brief concluding chapter brings together some general observations on the period. It is obvious that the plan here followed is not a consistent one, but it is justified by the nature of the material that has to be covered.

More open to question is the limitation in time which the author has adopted. As explained in the preface, "The period dealt with extends from 1066 to 1300. Not because either of these dates has a special significance in literary history, rather because they definitely have none." This sounds like the reasoning in *Alice in Wonderland*, where it is perhaps more appropriate. It is a pity that the Middle English period, which, in spite of diversity and change, has remarkable unity and continuity, should be presented thus in fragmentary form. The present book remains a torso, and we can only hope that Mr. Wilson plans to continue in a second volume the story he has begun.

In general the account given of types and individual works is the orthodox one since this did not "seem to be the occasion on which to bring forward any individual views of the author for the first time." There is a disposition to stress the native tradition and to minimize the effect of the Norman invasion. Mr. Wilson opposes the view that England was decadent on the eve of the Conquest, and believes that if the record were more complete it would tell a different story. It is natural that one who has given us three articles on the lost literature of Old and Middle English should stress the continued production of works in the national vernacular. But such enthusiasm occasionally leads to distortion. We are told (p. 197) that "there is evidence that the characters of the heroic age are still being celebrated, and a whole class of English romance deals with the heroes and subjects of Old English history." This is somewhat misleading and the impression is only partly corrected by the statement, "Many of the heroes of the older epic poetry must also have retained their popularity. Not a single romance dealing with them has survived. . . ." I feel that there is similar overstatement in such a sentence as "The rich lyric literature of the twelfth century, which scattered scraps of evidence proves [*sic*] to have existed, has almost completely vanished" (p. 295). That it has vanished is certain, that it was ever rich is very debatable. The statement that some particular work or whole class of works (if it ever existed) has "long since disappeared" occurs so often as to become a stylistic blemish and gives the impression that our losses have been greater than they well may have been. It is proper to emphasize the fact that there must have been poetry among the mass of the English speaking population and that, being largely unwritten, it has not come down to us. But we must not go too far. The Norman Conquest undoubtedly caused a severe dislocation of English cultural traditions, and the dislocation is no less great because the ultimate outcome was far from bad.

Apart from this unconscious enthusiasm for an idea, which we can readily forgive, the treatment of the period is sane, well-informed, and discriminating. There are minor inaccuracies which can be corrected in a second edition and points on which a reviewer will

differ and which the author may care to reconsider. In line with the author's emphasis upon an unbroken native tradition is the statement: "It has been assumed by some scholars that, during the two and a half centuries following the Conquest, French was extensively spoken in England . . . The evidence available hardly seems to warrant such a conclusion. It rather suggests, as indeed we might have expected, that French always remained a foreign language in this country" (p. 9). It does not much matter whether we call it a foreign language, the situation is much the same in Belgium today. But to deny that French was extensively spoken in England, when for a hundred and fifty years a large and influential class used nothing else, is rash. I have presented the evidence in detail elsewhere and need not repeat it here. Again there is the statement. "On the whole the evidence suggests that, during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, most of the upper classes were bilingual." I believe this is an overstatement. It is true that individual members of the upper classes could understand some English, even when they could not speak it, but it is very unlikely that "most of the upper class were bilingual." In the account of the *Ormulum*, of which only a portion has been preserved, it is suggested that the remainder may have been accidentally lost "or, more probably, it may never have been written." Yet Orm is very specific on this point. In the dedication to his brother he more than once speaks of the work as finished and says they ought to thank God that it is brought to an end. The suggestion that Orm drew from "such authorities as Bede, Isadore, and also perhaps from Old Norse sources" is a novel one in its last element, but I do not know of any justification for it save the Scandinavian character of his name. The most recent consideration of Orm's sources is H. C. Matthes, *Die Einheitlichkeit des Ormulum* (Heidelberg, 1933), where it is suggested that "the book" to which Orm frequently refers was a *Biblia cum glossis*. While there are difficulties in Matthes's hypothesis which justify an attitude at present of "not proved," some mention of the suggestion might well have been made. On p. 187 the *Northern Homily Cycle* is by a slip confused with the *Northern Passion*, the latter was later included in the expanded version of the former.

The chapter on the romance is a succinct and successful bit of condensation. Not every one will agree that "there can be little doubt of the actual existence of Arthur." I think it is altogether likely that a real figure lies behind the Arthur of romance, but there will probably always be doubt. Why is it said that Gildas *probably* has no mention of Arthur? The number according to Nennius who fell by Arthur's hand in his last great battle should be 960 and not 560 (p. 202), and it is not right to call Gildas and Nennius "two independent sources." The statement that most of Layamon's additions "can be found in contemporary French or Breton sources"

is puzzling. What are the Breton sources? And where in contemporary French sources is the account of the quarrel that led to the making of the Round Table? The possibility of identifying Sudene (p. 219) in *King Horn* does not seem so hopeless in the light of the paper of Walter Oliver (a business man of Scottish descent) in *PMLA.*, XLVI, 102-114. Havelok does not "secure the place of scullion to the cook of Earl Godrich" (p. 222), but of the Earl of Lincoln. Mr. Wilson thinks that "whilst the French romances were written for an aristocratic audience, the English versions seem to have been adapted by ruder poets for a lower class" (p. 229), and he feels the same way about the English lays. It would seem more likely that at least until the end of the fourteenth century the romances were turned into English for the class of people which had formerly enjoyed them in French but which was rapidly adopting English.

There are similar points in the rest of the book on which one feels a disposition to comment. The "somewhat vague figure" (p. 235) of Nicholas Bozon assumes greater sharpness in volume 36 of the *Histoire Littéraire*. One might question the statement that most of the extant *fabliaux* were apparently composed between 1150 and 1340, considering that most of the English examples of the genre and certainly the best were written by Chaucer. The explanation that in the "course of time the episode of the Magi combined with the play of the Shepherds to form the *Officium Stellae*" (p. 280) should be restated. The *Officium Stellae* developed independently of the shepherds, overshadowed and at times absorbed the *Officium Pastorum*. The statement that "in England itself little is known of the Latin drama of the Church before 1300" is all too true, but it would be equally true if the words "before 1300" were omitted, and considering that the *Visitatio Sepulchri* in the *Concordia Regularis* carries us back to the tenth century their omission would avoid ambiguity.

I should like to make it clear that questions of detail such as these do not detract seriously from this competent and stimulating survey. Mr. Wilson writes with enthusiasm and a nice appreciation of the literary qualities of the literature he treats. There are frequently good passages, such as the one on Wulfstan on p. 113. The author is to be congratulated on a welcome combination of scholarship and popular presentation and one can recommend his book without hesitation to students of this early period of English literature.

ALBERT C. BAUGH

University of Pennsylvania

Étude sur la carole médiévale, l'origine du mot et ses rapports avec l'église Par MARGIT SAHLIN. Upsala Almquist & Wiksell, 1940. Pp. xi + 243.

Mlle Sahlm, élève de M. Melander, s'est fait remarquer par des études étymologiques assez osées (sur le fr. *pucelle* qu'elle reconduisait à **pudic-ella*, sur l'a. fr. *laisse* qu'elle expliquait par *lectio*), mais qui trahissaient une compréhension profonde de l'influence des conceptions dogmatiques ou ecclésiastiques sur la vie spirituelle et le vocabulaire du moyen âge français. Cette fois elle revient à la charge et voici la teneur de son étude, étayée sur des études d'histoire littéraire, d'histoire ecclésiastique et d'histoire de la danse, étude qui tend à balayer radicalement toutes les explications étymologiques qu'ont essayées pour le mot *carole* tant de linguistes.

Nous avons essayé de démontrer que la *carole* médiévale était une espèce de "procession" ou de "danse," une marche rythmique, non liée à des règles fixes, mais accompagnée de chant responsorial.

Nous avons soutenu également que la désignation *carole* derivait de l'acclamation populaire *Kyrie eleison*, imposée par l'Eglise, et dont nous avons appris la grande vogue en d'autres circonstances, et que les chansons de caroles étaient à l'origine des espèces de litanies populaires, chantées à des danses ou processions de caractère rituel (p. 212).

Le développement de la chanson de carole nous montre de nouveau combien la littérature médiévale devait à l'Eglise: non seulement elle abondait en allusions aux choses d'Eglise, mais elle était souvent animée d'un esprit religieux, elle traitait volontiers des sujets pieux, et elle cherchait dans la poésie liturgique ses modèles de composition. Et de même au point de vue musical la chanson de carole nous fournit encore une preuve du fait connu que le chant profane s'inspirait du chant sacré, et l'imitait. Notre sujet relève particulièrement la grande importance qu'avait pour la chanson profane le chant litanique.

L'histoire de la "danse" carole, enfin, fait ressortir, dans un domaine déterminé, l'influence de l'Eglise sur les mœurs profanes: la vie sociale se réglait d'après des fêtes d'Eglise, et les usages festifs mondains se formaient sur le patron des cérémonies liturgiques.

D'autre part, l'histoire de l'acclamation *Kyrie eleison*, telle que nous l'avons envisagée, nous fournit encore une preuve palpable de la connexion organique qui subsistait entre la culture chrétienne du moyen âge et les cultures païennes antérieures (p. 213).

Ce résultat offre comme une synthèse des travaux de musicologie, d'histoire littéraire et religieuse de M. Spanke et des études de linguistique et d'histoire ecclésiastique de M. Rheinfelder.

Est-ce que le linguiste sera convaincu de l'équation *carole* = *Kyrie eleison*? Du point de vue sémantique (culturel), la thèse de Mlle Sahlm est impeccable: elle a démontré l'interpénétration générale de l'élément ecclésiastique et profane au moyen âge et, particulièrement, l'existence de l'acclamation populaire *Kyrie eleison*, usuelle aussi bien dans des circonstances joyeuses que solennelles, pour des fêtes d'église comme pour les divertissements mondains. Le traitement du côté formel de l'étymologie est plus sujet à caution. L'auteur suppose une accentuation *Kyriéleison* conservée

dans des hexamètres latins médiévaux et, dans de nombreuses langues modernes, par des mots du type du fr *kyrielle*. L'-o- de *carole* = *kyriel*-, qui reparaîtrait dans des variantes de *kyrie eleison* évidentes comme lorrain *kyriolé*, all *kyrieles*, bergam. *criolés*, s'expliquerait comme en lat. vulg. *toloneum*, *Mithrodates*, en a. fr. *cardonal*, *bosoigner*, *bohorder*, le -a- de *carole* à côté de *querole* souvent attesté, aurait évolué comme *mercatu* > *marchié*, d'ailleurs un esp *quirola* (trouvé par l'auteur dans Berceo à côté du terme *quiros fazien muy gran festa con quiros e con prosa, vió grandes quirolos, processiones tamannas*) conserverait le -i-, de même que le flamand a *kir*-, *ker*-, *kar*-, *kouriole*, enfin la disparition de -i- serait parallèle à *Neapolis* > *Naples*, a fr. *queriele* > *querele*, *caryophyllon* > *girofle*, it *mater(i)a*, a fr. *memo(i)re*, et serait appuyée par le suffixe -ole (de lat -iola), p. ex. a. fr. *maierole* = + *maï-ar-iola* le -i- serait conservé dans un glossaire de 1348 sous la forme latinisée du verbe *canolari* et dans un *cariole*, *hapax* chez Gautier de Coincy.

Toutes ces assertions ne sont pas de valeur égale : des cas comme *Mithrodates* trahissent l'hésitation vulgaire devant les deux membres d'un composé, le -o- de *cardonal* est peut-être une fausse restitution (semi-latinisante) comme dans *oïdonner*, au lieu de *ordener*, sur le subst. *ordo*—précisément parce qu'on savait que -o- intertonique donnait souvent -e- (*voulentiers*), on pouvait hyperlatiniser *cardenal* en *cardonal* ; des formes comme *bosoigner*, *bohorder* (et le lat. vulg. *toloneum*) sont des assimilations de *e-ó* en *o-ó*, contraires aux dissimilations *o-o* en *e-o* plus fréquentes (*enor*, *quenouille*, *serour*). Je suppose que des formes comme *kyriolé* sont dues à une tendance de variation (cf. en fr. *dublotin-folichon*) : la série de voyelles antérieures *y-e-e-é* est musicalement interrompue par un *o*. Ensuite, *querole* > *carole* ne montre pas de traitement identique à *marchié*, avec son *e* > *a* devant *r* + *consonne* ! ; l'esp. *quirola* pourrait aussi bien être une de ces altérations d'un mot étranger dont foisonnent p. ex. les glossaires espagnols publiés par Castro (*Glos. lat.-esp*, p. xxxvi *pistoforum* = *pastoforum*, *calnarius* = *calonarius* etc.)—et même un emprunt à l'a. fr. *querole*. Enfin, la disparition de -i- est très choquante, précisément à cause de la présence de *kyrielle*. si on variait le suffixe, pourquoi ne disait-on pas **kyriolle* (forme en fait attestée par le *Ysengrimus*, p. 86, et par les *kyriolés* de la Lorraine p. 123) ? A l'origine au moins, l'acclamation *kyrie eleison* et sa variante plus populaire devaient rester solidaires (malheureusement on ne trouve jamais non plus *kyrielle* comme nom de la carole). Un cas comme *girofle* est différent : il s'agit là d'un mot devenu totalement étranger à son étymon, comme le témoigne le développement de la voyelle initiale, alors que *ky-* de *kyrie eleison* n'a pas subi les traitements populaires de *cylindros*, *cydoneum* (> *co-*) ou *cymbalum*, *cyma* (> *ce-ci*). L'a. fr. *queriele* à côté de *querel(l)e* montre plutôt un *i* adventice

(l'étymon latin est *querêla*). L'ital. *matera* et l'a. fr. *memore* ne militent qu'en faveur d'un *-eria* (*-oria*) devenu final en roman. La forme latinisée *cariolari*, isolée, ne prouve rien non plus, et je n'ai pas le courage de rattacher le *cariole* de Gautier de Coincy (*il en est mais tel cariole* 'telle profusion d'images'), ensemble avec les passages d'Eustache Deschamps qui offrent *carole* (*telz images qui font caroles es moutiers ou trop en metons* etc., où le sens est 'danse, ronde, multitude'), à *kyrie eleison* = 'une kyrielle d'image': le *cariole* de Gautier pourrait bien être 'un char,' cf. le *-i-* de *chariot*, a. prov. *càrri* FEW I, 2, et cf. le *carriola* du même sens cité à la p. 71. S'appuyer sur une forme si ambiguë et qui serait la seule française à nous offrir le *-i-* dont nous avons besoin pour l'étymologie de Mlle Sahlén, est évidemment trop osé.

Somme toute, le côté formel de l'équation me semble encore bien loin de tout reproche. Mais l'histoire de l'acclamation *kyrie eleison* et celle de la *carole* restent des résultats à toute épreuve, même si l'identification des deux termes se révélait illusoire dans l'avenir. Le lecteur se surprend parfois à regretter que le beau résultat que lui propose l'auteur, ne soit pas encore tout à fait solidement établi.

Voici encore quelques mots romans que Mlle Sahlén, avec la force suggestive qui lui est propre, voudrait associer avec *carole* = *kyrie eleison* (p. 67 et 205) le port dial *charola* 'procession,' 'brancard de procession pour porter les images de saints,' 'niche pour placer ces images' mais il me semble clair qu'il faut partir du mot et du sens 'char' (I, 17 ce sont les *andas* ou *plataformas* des fêtes de Séville, les *jeux sur cars* de Picardie, cf. Cohen, *Le théâtre en France au moyen âge*), plus particulièrement d'un terme galloroman avec *ch-* (des traces d'un *char-ol* fr. et prov. se trouvent dans FEW, s. v. *carrus*, p. 429).

(P 69 et 208) le port *carôlo* 'farine grosse de millet ou de maïs,' 'morceau de pain (de millet),' 'râpe, épi égrené,' 'coup de bâton ou de main à la tête'; il est clair qu'on ne peut séparer ces mots de *collyra* (REW 2055) et *corolla* (REW 2243) qui se sont télescopés en roman, étymologies que Mlle Sahlén ne discute même pas. Pour le sens 'râpe,' il y a encore la concurrence de **carulium* (REW 1726) à envisager, cf. aussi l'aranaïs *karul'a* 'pomme de pin, maïs,' cité à la p. 71, pour le sens 'coup' (cf. aussi p. 210 l'esp. *rabanada*). On sait qu'en fr. pop. *pain* signifie 'coup' et que 'recevoir des coups' est exprimé chez beaucoup de peuples par 'manger (de la soupe etc),' quant à port. *carrola* *-ela* 'branche couverte de fruits et de fleurs,' cf. l'abruzz. *krolle* 'Schnur von Früchten' (REW s. v. *corolla*). Le lat. médiéval *carol(i)a* (p. 50) au sens d'une espèce de médaillon ou camée (p. ex. *anulum cum*). *Karola* in circuitu (!) ? *lapidum* et 8 *perlarum*) me paraît clairement = *corolla* (cf. dans REW 2243 les sens 'Kringel,' 'Schnur von Früchten,' 'Schnur zusammengebundener Fische').

Quelques remarques de détail: p. 48 l'expression *mener a la quarole* dans *Baud de Seb* veut dire plus particulièrement 'pendre,' comme on le voit par le v II, 718: *pendre fist les larons et encruier au vent*—il s'agit des nombreuses applications de la métaphore de la danse aux membres des pendus, cf. *Neuphil Mitt* 1935, p. 207—Pp. 92 et 1113 esp. *churrichote* 'prêtre français qui dit *churie eleison* au lieu de *kyrie*' ne me semble pas prouver un *churriar* 'dire les kyriés' (aussi peu que le *churriar* de Quevedo cité à la p. 99) et *churriar* 'boire' sera tout simplement le *churriar* onomatopéique, si autotone en espagnol et déjà attesté chez l'Archiprêtre

de Talavera (cf. *fi siffler un verre de vin*) *Churichote* me fait l'impression d'un *franchote*, péjoratif pour 'Français,' + *chuiar*, et la prononciation de *kyrie* imputée au prêtre français sera plutôt imaginaire — P 214 seq les fr *carole* et anglais *carrell* etc au sens de 'pupitie à écrire dans une fenêtre' ne seront pas **cathedr* -(i)olu, puisqu'il n'y a qu'un seul témoignage pour l'a fr de *chaerole*, mais alors vraiment au sens de 'chaise,' plutôt ce *quadrellu* qu'envisage l'auteur à la p 216, note 2 — P 219 *carolle* (de la cheminée), que l'auteur a trouvé en 1395 et en latin du VIII^es (*carola*), ainsi que le catalan *carola* 'part superior de la ximenea' ne seront non plus des *cathedra*. La forme *corola* se trouve, ce que ne nous dit pas l'auteur, au même sens dans Dicc Aguiló: ces deux formes sont des doublets du cat *curull*, qui signifie exactement la même chose et est évidemment *corolla* (REW s v).

Pour terminer, je me permets de mentionner une suggestion étymologique qui m'est venue à l'esprit pendant la lecture du volume intéressant la locution toscane *a isonne* 'en abondance' est une forme apocopée de *kyrie eleison* et le sémantisme s'explique par la répétition de cette acclamation populaire (p 86 et 110) — je me demande aujourd'hui si le toscan *a rosa* (à l'origine burlesque), qui a la même signification, ne rendrait pas la vocalisation d'un **crialosa*, métathèse de **crialèso*(n) italien (cf. bergam. *crialèso* p. 111 et la vocalise dans une litanie gasconne citée à la p. 126 *aeon*).

LEO SPITZER

Oberon. A Poetical Romance in Twelve Books. Translated from the German of Wieland by JOHN QUINCY ADAMS. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by A. B. FAUST. New York. F. S. Crofts & Co, 1940. Pp. xcii + 340. 8vo. \$3.00.

Professor Faust's edition of John Quincy Adams's translation of Wieland's *Oberon* represents one of the greatest literary "finds" of the present century. On the evidence of Adams's direct testimony, given more than a century ago, scholars have usually credited the sixth President of the United States with making a translation of *Oberon*, but since the manuscript was never produced (indeed, its location was generally unknown until Dr. Faust came upon it among the Adams Family Archives in the Massachusetts Historical Society), biographers and critics contented themselves with a bare statement that Adams performed the labor, and thus dropped the matter. The full text is at last before us. It is impossible to avoid raising the challenging question whether Adams's *Oberon* is entitled to rank with Bryant's *Homer*, Longfellow's *Divine Comedy*, and Bayard Taylor's *Faust* as the great metrical translations made by Americans.

Wieland's *Oberon* had been translated into English before John Quincy Adams undertook the task in 1799, while he was resident in Berlin as United States Minister Plenipotentiary to Prussia

(1797-1801). The version prepared by James Six in 1781, failing to win Wieland's approval, remained unpublished, as apparently did two other versions by unnamed translators. Coleridge's projected translation of 1797 never materialized. That by William Sotheby of 1798 won Wieland's approbation, and was printed in London in two volumes in 1798.

That Adams was unaware of earlier efforts to render *Obeiron* into English appears in pertinent extracts from Adams's copious diaries which Dr. Faust reprints in his Introduction. The story as it is revealed there, both in Adams's own words and in the illuminating notes added by the editor, is a remarkable one, indicative at once of the steps by which one interest leads to another and of the procedure by which a notable translation may come into being. Moreover, the whole is distinctly more than an episode in the life of a President of the United States, and future historians and critics of American culture will take more than passing note of John Quincy Adams's efforts as a translator and as an enthusiast for German literature fifteen years before Madame de Staël published her epoch-making *De l'Allemagne*. Equally important is the story recounted by Professor Faust of how Adams proceeded, with characteristic pertinacity, to indulge what he spoke of in another connection as "a strong and almost innate passion for literary pursuits." Dr. Faust's researches not only explain but justify President Adams's words, heretofore sometimes mistaken for sentimental affectation or idle boasting: "Could I have carved out my own fortunes, to literature would my whole life have been devoted. . . . The consummation of happiness has been denied me."

Although the translation was begun as a mere exercise to aid his study of the German language (a speaking knowledge of which he despaired of and never fully attained), it became soon an all-engrossing employment. He proceeded quite methodically to make, first, a careful analytical abstract (reproduced by Professor Faust) and, second, a very literal, word-for-word, line-for-line translation. About the time he completed his translation of the first book he heard about Sotheby's translation and of Wieland's satisfaction with it, but the news did less to dash his spirits than to spur him on to greater concentration of effort. He consulted the sources and parallels of Wieland's story, among them Count Tressan's *Huon*, Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare, and Pope, and worked at his task to the exclusion of all others, until May 22, 1800, when he began "to give a little polish to the verse." On December 4, 1800, he saw for the first time Sotheby's translation. A year later he acknowledged it to be "so much superior to what mine would be in its best state, that stanza compared [with stanza] in the two versions, would fill me with mortification, were I desirous of poetical fame." Even so he did not lay aside the task of polishing, and eventually four separate manuscripts (three of them complete translations) came into being, all in Adams's own clear, firm handwriting. Dr.

Faust reproduces the text of the fourth, most finished, of the versions.

Thirty years after his Berlin residence, that is, shortly after his term as President, Adams wrote to Carl Follen congratulating the latter upon his appointment as professor of German at Harvard. He mentioned his own "enthusiastic relish for German literature" in general and for Wieland in particular, adding that but for Sotheby's having got the start of him, he should have published his translation of *Oberon*.

When I saw his translation [he writes], I was content to keep mine in my *portefeuille*. My German teacher sent a copy of the first canto of my translation to Wieland himself, and asked him his opinion of it, which he gave with frankness. He compared it with Sotheby's translation, then just published, and gave the palm of poetry to him, and of fidelity to me; a decision which my judgment fully confirmed.

Professor Faust advances strong arguments, supported by adequate evidence, that Adams was needlessly modest. To be sure, Sotheby exhibits a greater facility as a versifier, but it is questionable whether re-writing and fine-writing are to be preferred to honest translating. Both men possessed an adequate knowledge of German, neither is guilty of glaring errors of interpretation—Adams of none, and Sotheby only when he seems more concerned with poetic diction and meter-making than with the strict meaning. Moreover, neither followed strictly Wieland's *ottava rima*. Adams reproduces the eight-line stanza of Wieland, often with freely interlaced rimes like the original, but makes a strong effort to apply a uniform rime scheme, ababcbcd, and adheres to the decasyllabic line except for the eighth, which is often an Alexandrine. Sotheby, on the other hand, uses the nine-line Spenserian stanza, with variations in the rime scheme. Naturally the extra line enables him to be prodigal in his figurativeness and to sprinkle his text with "improvements" and "added graces."

The greatest difference—and here Adams has clearly the advantage—arises from Sotheby's squeamishness which led him to mutilate Wieland's poem to the extent of omitting altogether from Canto VI the fifty-nine stanzas detailing the January-May episode. A footnote informs the reader that this story is "sufficiently known" to English readers from the "January and May" by Pope, meanwhile the continuity of narrative is broken and the motivation lost so as to make the action unintelligible. In the third edition, from which the first American edition was printed, Sotheby's deference to prudery betrayed him into sacrificing seventy-four stanzas on the altar of respectability. The rigorously Puritanic Adams saw no harm in them and rendered them all in admirable English. Thus it is that Adams has given us the only complete translation of Wieland's *Oberon* in the English language.

Jean Paul. Der schöpferische Humor. Von KURT BERGER.
Verlag Hermann Bohlaus Nachf., Weimar, 1939. XII, 419 S.

Der Auftrieb, den die Jean-Paul-Literatur durch das Jubiläum des 100. Todestages (1925) erfahren hat, ist nicht, wie es wohl sonst zu geschehen pflegt, bald wieder abgeebbt, sondern die Beschäftigung mit dem originellen Outsider der klassischromantischen Literaturepoche bleibt anhaltend rege. Neben zahlreichen Zeitschriftenaufsätzen, Vorträgen, Dissertationen und wissenschaftlichen Einzeluntersuchungen, die in der historischkritischen Gesamtausgabe (von der jetzt 21 Bände vorliegen) eine zuverlässige Unterlage finden, fehlt es auch nicht an grosszügig zusammenfassenden und überschauenden Werken. Den umfassenden Biographien von Harich und Alt (1925) und dem monumentalen Werk von Kommerell (1933) reiht sich nun die nicht ganz so umfangreiche, aber ebenfalls entschlossen aufs ganze gehende Schrift von Kurt Berger an, die der Vorbemerkung zufolge schon 1934 im Manuskript abgeschlossen wurde, aber aus äusseren Ursachen erst 1939 veröffentlicht werden konnte.

Wie so viele vor ihm (und vermutlich auch nach ihm) hat Berger versucht, in der Fülle, Mannigfaltigkeit und Gegensatzlichkeit von Jean Pauls menschlicher und dichterischer Persönlichkeit den beherrschenden Einheitspunkt aufzuzeigen. Er findet diesen, wie schon der Untertitel besagt, in dem *schöpferischen Humor*. Damit stellt sich Berger mit gutem Recht einer gewissen Einseitigkeit in der Auffassung des Dichters entgegen, wie sie sich bei manchen früheren Jean-Paul-Forschern und -Verehrern gezeigt hatte, die über dem hohen Pathos und dichterischen Schwung in Jean Pauls Schöpfungen allzu sehr vergassen, dass er denn doch zuerst und zutiefst Humorist war. Indessen scheint mir doch auch Bergers Bemühung, alles und jedes bei dem Dichter aus der einen Quelle des schöpferischen Humors abzuleiten, nicht durchaus geglückt zu sein. Es geht entschieden zu weit, wenn Berger etwa behauptet, dass es bei Jean Paul keinen hohen Menschen gebe, der nicht auch Humorist sei (S. 59), dass die magische Naturansicht des Dichters aus dem Geist des Humors fliessen (S. 75), und dass der *Titan* seiner Idee nach eine Schöpfung des Humors sei (S. 351). Berger muss, um solche Behauptungen aufrecht erhalten zu können, den Begriff des schöpferischen Humors so weit und so unbestimmt fassen, dass das Eigentliche und Spezifische des Humors darüber fast verloren geht, wie er denn auch über das Verhältnis Jean Pauls zu seinen humoristischen Vorgängern, wie Cervantes, Swift, Sterne, Hippel, wenig Neues und Ergiebiges vorzubringen weiss. Zuweilen erlaubt er sich seiner Grundthese zuliebe kleine Sinnverfälschungen. So sagt Jean Paul z. B. in der *Vorschule der Ästhetik* (§ 15) nicht, wie Berger angibt (S. 193), dass der *Humor* "das unbehelfliche Leben mit dem ätherischen Sinn versöhnt," sondern es ist da von dem Genius im allgemeinen die Rede.

Ebensowenig hat er in der *Vorschule* ausgesprochen, dass der Humor der Geist sei, der das Ganze seines Werks durchziehe (Berger S. 12), und die Behauptung, er habe in der *Vorschule* den Humor in den Mittelpunkt allen dichterischen Schaffens gerückt (S. 380), ist zum mindesten stark übertrieben. Die von Berger (S. 192) zitierte Stelle über die Indifferenz am Schluss der *Vorschule* gibt nicht Jean Pauls eigene Meinung wieder, sondern die von ihm bekämpfte Schellingsche Ansicht. Auch dem Begriff der *Novelle* gibt Berger eine allzu willkürliche und vage Auslegung, wenn er Jean Pauls *Giannozzo* (S. 359), *Schmelzle* und *Fibel* (S. 390 f.) darunter begreift, höchstens *Katzenbergers Badereise* lässt sich allenfalls als Novelle im üblichen Sinn des Wortes bezeichnen.

Trotz gründlicher Beherrschung des Stoffs sind dem Verfasser manche kleinen Versehen untergelaufen. Swift war nicht der jüngere Zeitgenosse Richardsons (S. 242), sondern 22 Jahre älter als dieser Jean Pauls Jugendfreund Hermann ist nicht im November 1790 freiwillig aus dem Leben geschieden (S. 296 und 326), sondern Anfang 1790 an der Schwindsucht gestorben. Lord Horion kann unmöglich nach dem Vorbild des in die Kaspar-Hauser-Affäre verwickelten Lords Stanhope gezeichnet sein (S. 336), der bei Abfassung des *Hesperus* noch ein Knabe war und erst nach Jean Pauls Tode öffentlich hervorgetreten ist, und auch nicht nach Goethe, den Jean Paul erst nach Vollendung des Romans kennen lernte. Ebensowenig konnte Roquairol ein Vorbild für Tiecks Lovell sein (S. 355), da der *Titan* erst nach dem Tieckschen Roman erschienen ist. S. 116 und 166 verwechselt Berger Linda mit Liane, S. 335 Pestiz mit Flachsenfingen, S. 337 die Insel der Vereinigung im *Hesperus* mit der Isola bella im *Titan*, S. 385 den Herzog Georg von Meiningen mit dem Herzog Emil August von Gotha. S. 296 wird eine Stelle aus Spaziers Biographie (der Berger überhaupt zu kritiklos folgt) irrig Jean Paul selber zugeschrieben. Den 1845 erschienenen *Papierdrachen* hält Berger (S. 416) anscheinend für ein von Jean Paul selber komponiertes Werk, während es sich doch nur um eine von dem Herausgeber Ernst Forster willkürlich zusammengestellte Sammlung nachgelassener Schriften handelt. Mit der Chronologie springt Berger zuweilen etwas achtlos um, wenn er z. B. den *Titan* vor dem *Fixlein* und *Siebenkas* behandelt. Überhaupt scheint mir die ganze Anordnung des Werks der Klarheit und Übersichtlichkeit zu entbehren. Die Fussnoten enthalten reichliche und wertvolle Hinweise auf die Jean-Paul-Literatur, haben aber oft keinen rechten Zusammenhang mit dem Text und scheinen erst nachtraglich hinzugefügt worden zu sein.

Die vorstehenden grundsätzlichen Bedenken und Einzeleinwendungen können und sollen jedoch den Wert des Buchs im ganzen nicht in Frage stellen. Es finden sich viele feine und treffende Bemerkungen und Beobachtungen, manche tiefendringenden Ausführungen darin, z. B. über die Landschaftsschilderungen (S

70 ff.) und über das Stammesmassige bei Jean Paul (S. 219 ff.). Kann Bergers Werk auch dem Kommerellschen an Tiefe der Auffassung, an Scharfe der Zergliederung und an Eindringlichkeit des Stils nicht zur Seite gesetzt werden, so gebührt ihm doch als einer wertvollen Ergänzung zu früheren Werken über den Dichter und als Dokument liebe- und verständnisvoller Beschäftigung mit dem grossen deutschen Humoristen eine ehrenvolle Stelle in der Jean-Paul-Literatur.

EDUARD BEREND

Genf

Holderlin. By RONALD PEACOCK. London, Methuen & Co., 1938. Pp. ix, 175. 10.6 sh.

English critics have recently contributed some of the most individual and vital literary studies to Germanic scholarship: Fairley's book on "Goethe" and Miss Butler's stimulating essay on "The Tyranny of Greece" are among them, and they are now followed by an admirably fresh critical study of Holderlin's poetry. For the biographical part, Mr. M. Montgomery's *Friedrich Holderlin and the German Neo-Hellenic Movement* (1923) has provided the English scholar with an elementary though pedantic and, indeed, misleading starting point. Mr. Peacock's approach is different, bolder and, I think, extremely fruitful as an exemplary piece of literary criticism. For him the biographical and historical point of view is not, ultimately, the most exciting and he rightly claims that "an author and his development are only interesting because each of his works has values in itself." With a keen sense for specific poetic qualities, he emphasizes therefore throughout his study "certain commanding tendencies of thought and belief, certain persistent spiritual preoccupations which are constantly seeking expression in Holderlin's work." In eleven brief chapters he establishes the basic elements of Holderlin's poetry and elucidates in the first group ("Nature and Life," "Nature and Myth," "Nature and Culture") some of the polar propositions of Holderlin's narrow yet intense poetic inspiration. He examines in detail not only the significance of the hero-imagery but also the implications of Holderlin's vision of Greece and attempts convincingly to show the all-embracing importance of the Diotima experience for the poetry of Holderlin's "middle period." In the three final chapters, Mr. Peacock most happily applies these fundamental ideas to particular issues ("Prophetic Poetry," "The National in Nature and Poetry" and "Personal Destiny"), and justly stresses the hieratic intention of the poet's work as a whole. He does not, of course, overlook the possible relationship of Holderlin's "gods" to Christian doctrine, but is not willing—as some recent critics are in-

clined to do (*e.g.* R. Guardini in his extremely interesting volume *Holderlin*, 1939)—to press the poet's theomorphism into a dogmatic pattern. Now and again, especially in his summary ("Characteristics"), Mr. Peacock dissociates himself from the overzealous Holderlin critics of the last two decades. With all his profound admiration for Holderlin he refuses to see in his later poems the exclusive prototype of the poetic, and deplores a tendency amongst German Holderlin enthusiasts to attribute greater importance to the poetic medium than to the poems themselves.

To free the text from incidental academic material, Mr. Peacock adds a brief chronology and a working bibliography which indicates a thorough familiarity with even the most esoteric contributions to present-day Holderlin scholarship. The poems, which are quoted throughout the text in the original, are given in excellent prose translations at the end of the book.

Together with Pierre Bertaux' *Holderlin. Essai de biographie intérieure* (Paris 1936), Mr. Peacock's study is now the most accessible and most generally stimulating recent treatment of Holderlin's work.

VICTOR LANGE

Cornell University

Ronsard Prince of Poets. By MORRIS BISHOP. New York: Oxford University Press, 1940. Pp. 253.

This is frankly a work of vulgarization, based on the researches of Laumonier, Longnon (for the earlier period), Pierre Champion and others. Its vivid and realistic style lives up to what we have learned to admire in Professor Bishop's publications. Since this feature of the book is its great asset, it may be said at once that Professor Bishop is successful in paraphrasing Ronsard's thought and, above all, in translating some of his lyrics. Among the best of these is:

I hail thee, happy, profitable Death

and many others equally as good could be cited. His version, however, of *Mignonne, allons voir si la rose* seems to me to fail in bringing out the high points of the original

Mignonne, we'll seek the rose
That we have watched unclothe
This morning to the sun,
We'll see if she display
The color that gleamed so gay,
Now that day is done

Since this poem (in all anthologies) is perhaps the best expression of the *carpe rosam* theme in the Renaissance, a version closer to the original might have been attempted—*e.g.*.

Mignonne, let us see if the rose,
Which this morning did uncloze
Her robe of crimson to the light,
Has this evening lost her bloom
—Nature's garments fade so soon—
And her tint like yours so bright

In other words, what is essential in a translation is that it should convey not only in the rhythm but also in the ideas the spirit of the original, and what Ronsard (here following Ausonius) stresses is (1) the morning and evening contrast, (2) the similitude of the rose's blossom to the folds of a woman's gown, (3) the comparison with the lady herself (Cassandre).

This brings me to the main issue in Mr. Bishop's treatment. As biography, such tests as I have had time to make indicate that he has adequately covered the ground. Especially good are his locality descriptions. In other instances he uses his imagination to describe events which would be significant if they could be proved to have occurred as he states them. But that is any biographer's privilege. On two essential points, however, I have my doubts. The love affairs (not only the three important ones) are overstressed, so that the reader is left with an overdose of Ronsard's eroticism, which does not appear to me to be true to fact. And what is more important, the neglect of the historical method (symptomatic of modern criticism) leads Bishop (p. 76) to underestimate the value of the Pléiade's *Défense et Illustration* as a critical document and also to miss the fact that Ronsard and his brigade had a definite doctrine¹ of "imitation." As a consequence, the Pindaric Odes (the *Ode à Michel de l'Hospital* is not analysed) are not appreciated; their occasional but characteristic beauties overlooked; and many another passage in the poet's work, it seems to me, is given a wrong emphasis.²

But the fact remains that Mr. Bishop has produced an entertaining and useful book, which all lovers of French literature should read. The following paragraph (from the end of the book) may serve to justify this judgment.

With all of his bathos, his pretension, his absurdity, his lack of philosophy, [Ronsard] was a poet . . . The men of the Renaissance were surely not far wrong when they termed [him] the Prince of Poets. He was their Prince, the incarnation of their ideal. The Renaissance, the New Birth, was one of the recurring springtimes of history. Men had the sense of new things beginning, in art, faith, and life. In spite of the storms about them, and the mischief of their days, they felt that they were preparing the high summer to come.

WM. A. NITZE

The University of Chicago

¹ The bare reference on p. 80 is quite inadequate.

² See, however, the excellent characterization of the lighter verse on p. 82.

Voltaire's Poème sur la loi naturelle A Critical Edition. By FRANCIS J. CROWLEY. Berkeley, California, Publications of the University of California at Los Angeles in Languages and Literatures, Volume I, No. 4, 1938. Pp. 177-304.

The publication of a critical text of the *Poème* is an important contribution to the new editions of works of Voltaire issued in recent years. But the intention of the present editor is not only to publish a revised text—he has made “a critical study of the *Poème* in the hope of gaining for the work the recognition it deserves” (182). The *Poème* had numerous editions during the eighteenth century—the author has examined about forty editions and two manuscript copies for the establishment of his critical text—and this popularity is for Professor Crowley one more proof of the importance it has as a statement of Voltaire’s religious and ethical ideas. Norman L. Torrey, in his review of the book, remarks pertinently, that the *Poème* was given to the public at the same time as the *Poème sur le désastre de Lisbonne*, and that “the popularity of the poems can hardly be judged separately.”¹ We agree also with Professor Torrey’s remark that it would have been better to follow the tradition and to publish both poems together in a critical edition. There can be no doubt, I believe, that the *Poème sur le désastre de Lisbonne* is more profound in its philosophy and more delicate in poetic feeling than the *Poème sur la loi naturelle*.

The critical study preceding the text introduces the reader to the philosophical and historical background of the *Poème*, its genesis, and the history of its publications. The short sketch of the history of the *loi naturelle* is, even for its limited purpose, rather general, since one cannot trace the history of this great idea by enumerating detached quotations from Bodin, Bayle, Pufendorf, etc. More positive is Professor Crowley’s indication of the historical origin of the *Poème*, namely, the controversy between Jesuits and Jansenists, which stirred up public life in France. The civil disorder resulting from the controversy became a very important motive for Voltaire’s criticism of religious intolerance in the poem. The second motive which Professor Crowley adduces for the composition of the *Poème* was Voltaire’s opposition to the atheistic currents of his epoch. Here it is proved that the *Anti-Sénèque ou le Souverain Bien* of La Mettrie provoked Voltaire’s attack, and thus the argument of the Moland edition, that Voltaire’s attack is directed against the *Homme-machine*, is definitely refuted.² Though Professor Crowley’s correction is sound, it is not new, since in 1909 the editor of the correspondence of Frederick the

¹ *RR*, xxxi (April, 1940), 183

² Dr R. Boissier in his *La Mettrie, médecin, pamphlétaire, et philosophe*, Paris, 1931, gave the same reference as the Moland edition.

Great with Voltaire identified the *Anti-Sénèque* as the work of La Mettrie mentioned in Voltaire's letter of August 1752³

We hear little about Frederick's influence on the genesis of the *Poème*, which must have been considerable. At Frederick's critical suggestion, Voltaire revised the work several times. In 1756 he wrote about the first version (1751), "C'était un poème très informe . . . Je l'ai beaucoup corrigé depuis" (Moland, xxxviii, p. 551). Certainly, the first version is apparently lost, and we do not possess Frederick's corrections. However, an analysis of the conformity and divergence in Voltaire's and Frederick's ideas on the topics of the *Poème* would show the details about which Frederick might have made suggestions for change.

Many will regret that Professor Crowley's philosophical interpretation of the *Poème* is somewhat sketchy and vague. He excludes, *e. g.*, from his investigation the juridical aspect of the *loi naturelle*, and considers only the theological one. Unjustly, as it seems to us, for the verses dealing with the authority of the state and the equality of everybody before the law, concern precisely the juridical aspect. The remarks on Voltaire's polemic against La Mettrie's atheism would have been more valuable if the author had pointed out its connection with the extensive polemic against every form of atheism and materialism in which Voltaire and Frederick joined.

Although the reader regrets the absence of any commentary on the stylistic features of the various versions and of any discussion of the poem as a work of art, Professor Crowley's editorial care is exact and thoroughly to be commended.

HERBERT DIECKMANN

Washington University

England's Eliza. By ELKIN CALHOUN WILSON. Harvard Studies in English, XX. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939. Pp. xii + 479. \$5.00.

Mr. Wilson makes a comprehensive survey of an impressive amount of English and Latin poetry written in praise of Elizabeth. Her personality and the achievements of her reign made an immense appeal to the imaginations of her Renaissance subjects, and she was portrayed in such representative rôles as the Queen of Shepherds, the Lady of the Sea, the royal Laura (archetype for sonneteers), the English Diana, and finally Gloriana, but preceding and more important than any of these, and often underlying them, was the

³ Publikationen aus den K. Preussischen Staatsarchiven 82 Band. R. Koser und H. Droysen, Briefwechsel Friedrich des Grossen mit Voltaire Zweiter Teil 1740-1753 Leipzig, 1909. Brief Voltaires vom August 1752

popular Protestant concept of her as the English Judith or Deborah. Devotion to Elizabeth almost became a cult, and one fervid Protestant poet called for the substitution of a "Vivat Eliza" for an "Ave Maria," and one pageant included an altar to Elizabeth, the vestal, and decorated the edifice with verses filled with echoes of the liturgy of the Church. The epitome of these various idealizations and the epic expression of the glory of her reign are found in the *Faerie Queene*, but although the book throws considerable light on the background of Spenser's poem, the chapter devoted to its interpretation is disappointingly conventional.

Mr. Wilson oversimplifies the influence of the politico-religious situation on much of the material he is treating. Due to Mary Stuart's claim to the uncertain succession, the Protestants realized that the sole bulwark between them and an almost certain war or the restoration of Catholicism was the life of the Queen, and this was one of the reasons they practically made her a symbol of their faith. After the defeat of the Spanish Armada, they felt some sense of security, but by then the tradition of the English Deborah was part of the Protestant national consciousness. The same oversimplification is found in the account of the devotion of Elizabeth's "knights" to her. There is no adequate indication of the dubious loyalty of men like Leicester and that uncertain number of peers who carried on secret negotiations with Mary Stuart, nor does he show clearly the conflict between religion and nationalism, or ambition, on the part of certain Catholic writers. Mr. Wilson suggests that Elizabeth could distinguish between the true and false notes among her poets, but he seldom makes any attempt to do so himself.

A chapter on foreign opinion would have given far more balance to the book. Mr. Wilson suggests that the "insular veils" were rent all along by foreigners at court, but he fails to point out that these "veils" were partly religious. The Huguenots show some marked similarities with the English Protestants in their attitude towards Elizabeth, but the French Catholics join with the English and Scotch exiles in calling her a cruel heretic, a Jezebel, a "vilaine publique." Since this material, which is readily accessible in Ascoli's *La Grande-Bretagne devant l'opinion française* (Paris, 1927), militates against what almost amounts to a thesis in the book, namely, that it was Elizabeth herself much more than the situation in which she was placed which evoked such devotion from her subjects, its exclusion seems an unwise restriction in scope. In consciously avoiding the literature written by Elizabeth's enemies (p. 406), Mr. Wilson has failed to discover that some of the material he is treating was partially inspired by attacks on the Queen. The relation of Spenser to such attacks was pointed out by the present reviewer in "The *Faerie Queene* and the Mary Stuart Controversy" (*ELH* II, 192-214). Apart from such omissions, there

is a distinct weakness in a number of places where he seeks ultimate causes in fields where his sources are not only secondary but inadequate. Thus, his account of the courtly love tradition, which is based mainly on Dodd's *Courtly Love in Chaucer and Gower* (Boston, 1913), and his application of it to the devotion of Elizabeth's courtiers to her, are extremely weak.

It is an unpleasant task to criticize a book for weakness in the use of secondary sources when it contains so much rare and original material. The liberal use of quotations and a number of facsimiles carry out the Elizabethan spirit, and the appendix contains a valuable short-title list of works dedicated, inscribed, or presented to the Queen. With certain reservations, this book will remain the definitive treatment of the part Elizabeth played in firing the imaginations of her poets to celebrate her reign and the glory of their Queen.

KERBY NEILL

The Catholic University of America

Painter and Poet, Studies in the Literary Relations of English Painting. The Charles Eliot Norton Lectures for 1937-1938. By CHAUNCEY BREWSTER TINKER. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938. Pp. xiv + 195. \$3.50.

This book, outside and in, is a source of pleasure to the eye; and the Harvard Press deserves praise for its designing and presswork. There were difficulties for the designer, in that *Painter and Poet* contains 89 illustrations filling 66 pages, whereas the amount of text is relatively small (barely 130 pages). The problem was solved by use of the same paper for both text and illustrations, and by the inclusion of the pictures in the pagination. These pictures, by Romney, Hogarth, Reynolds, Gainsborough, Blake, Richard Wilson, Turner, and Constable, deserve the integral position they are thus given in the book. Some, of course, are familiar; but as a whole they form a surprisingly fresh, attractive, and valuable exhibition of the poetic strain in English pictorial art of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. They are the fruit of careful search, and of much knowledge, and virtually they *are* the book.

Of the accompanying lectures it is not easy to speak justly. When the lectures were delivered, the pictures were projected on a screen and Professor Tinker's words formed the commentary. Hence the lectures are actually, in large part, a series of appreciative and descriptive captions. As such, they probably served their immediate purpose well; but this is a method of presentation that cannot be transferred into a printed book. There, the relation between picture and text is inevitably reversed; and, in addition, we

lose the living voice and something of the living personality. Professor Tinker's taste, urbanity, and freedom from pedantry remain, but these qualities are not in themselves enough to make the lectures fit for print

We are informed by the publisher that "Professor Tinker considers his book a vindication of the layman's right to look at pictures for the subject matter they represent, particularly as illustrations of characters and events." The words arouse a mild surprise, because they encourage a suspicion that Professor Tinker may have been at a loss how to consider his book. In the Preface he says that his treatment of his subject "was from the beginning meant to be suggestive rather than closely defined", and in some of the lectures the treatment certainly suggests the author's complete sympathy with the eighteenth-century painters' revolt against this layman's view. The truth is, that though "suggestive" treatment may be engaging, a writer must at least, if only privately and for himself, define closely his *subject*, and even the subjects within his subject. To take an isolated instance, the chapter on Richard Wilson, which opens better than most with a useful discussion of the word "landscape," ends by giving Professor Tinker away. Throughout the chapter he is at pains to characterize Wilson as "a serene spirit"—"the gentle Wilson," "cool and austere," "troubled by no turbulent passions," "incapable of satire." But Professor Tinker also had in his notes an anecdote, too good to omit, which proves that "Wilson had a sharp wit and a gift of repartee" (p. 134), and was capable of a quick fit of derisive anger. These traits are not reconcilable with the rest of the characterization, but the author is unconscious of a problem. Readers, however, will conclude that desultory chat about Romanticism and Thomson and painting makes an insubstantial meal. And in fact, were it not for the long series of plates, *Painter and Poet* would be only one more piece of evidence to show why Professor Tinker's services to eighteenth-century studies have been so closely confined to the personal help he has given university students and fellow scholars.

ROBERT SHAFER

University of Cincinnati

The Rise of Romantic Hellenism in English Literature, 1732-1786.

By BERNARD HERBERT STERN. Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Publishing Company, 1940. Pp. x + 182. \$2.25.

Wealthy young noblemen drink "To Grecian Taste and Roman Spirit," sponsor archaeological expeditions, and publish the findings in sumptuous folios; travellers record the adventures of their

sensitive souls in Eastern lands, aestheticians discover the key to Beauty in the "noble simplicity and quiet grandeur" of Grecian art; poets tune their British lyres to Attic themes—such are the main strands in *The Rise of Romantic Hellenism in English Literature, 1732-1786*. The outlines of this useful study are familiar, yet Mr Stern adds many details in the most extensive survey yet published of the growth of "Grecian gusto" in the eighteenth century.

Although his work clearly reveals that "the transformation of the neo-classical attitude toward the ancients into romantic hellenism was, like many of the other streams of romanticism, a gradual growth in popularity of an attitude present in the neo-classical period itself," Mr. Stern allows himself surprisingly few backward glances. Thus we have no indication as to "romantic hellenic" tendencies already at work when the dilettanti banded together in 1732, such as the conception of Grecian Homer, bard of "fire" and Nature and "simplicity." Then, too, "the sentimental admiration of ancient Greek culture in general, particularly its government and its bravery" and "expressions of sympathy for the subjection of the modern Greeks to the Turks"—two of the elements which mid-eighteenth-century travel books are said to have "contributed" to romantic hellenism—had appeared in Milton, Waller, and Addison.

More unfortunate is Mr. Stern's neglect of Shaftesbury, Jonathan Richardson, Senior, and other forerunners of Winckelmann (whose influence on English letters, as he shows, comes late, although Blake's reading of Fuseli's translation in the '70's deserves mention at least). The "Grecian" speculations of Shaftesbury, "the Plato of the eighteenth century," gave French and English as well as German theorists both moral and intellectual bases for "the sentimental-philosophical reaction to the picturesque baroque and rococo," which constitutes, according to Mr. Stern, "the strongest influence in the rise of romantic hellenism in aesthetics."

In his historical and descriptive account of the literature of archaeology, travel, and aesthetics during the fifty-four years composing his special preserve, Mr. Stern is on firmer ground. Moreover, an abundant display of the parallel tastes of dilettanti, travelers, aestheticians, and poets sustains his analysis of the movements of thought and feeling in the eighteenth century which "directed the idealization of antiquity to Greece."

STEPHEN A. LARRABEE

Waterville, Maine

Epic Suggestion in the Imagery of the Waverley Novels. By CHRISTABEL F. FISKE. New Haven. Yale University Press, 1940. Pp. xxvi + 141. \$2.50.

Starting with the conviction that the epic element in Scott's novels has been greatly neglected by criticism in favor of the romantic, Professor Fiske has made a systematic comparison of the figurative imagery of the Waverley novels with that of Homer, and to a lesser degree the Teutonic epics and the Old Testament. She first shows parallels in the treatment of metaphors and similes concerning various aspects of nature—landscape, the sea, wild and domestic animals—as well as similarities in thematic and atmospheric imagery. Another division of the study is concerned with certain miscellaneous motifs such as the personification of weapons, the image of the lion and his lair, the comparison of thought to the flight of a bird and the like. In addition to such specific comparisons of imagery the author finds many stylistic traits that suggest the epic style.

As a study of Scott's imagery the work is a valuable contribution. One lays it down with an increased respect for the keen observation and wide experience of the author, for the imagination that continually played over everything he wrote illuminating it with images from all aspects of nature and life. One is also convinced that some of the images studied may be vague recollections of Homer or Beowulf or the Old Testament.

But surely she has gone too far when she supposes any such recollection is necessary for Scott when he uses the lion as the symbol of the fierce warrior. This image and many others mentioned are simply ideas common to all observers of life and may appear in the work of any sensitive author. Particularly is this true of images concerning the sea and mountains (p. 7). The author is at pains to show that Scott used such images, but only as short striking metaphors instead of elaborate Homeric similes. If he had used not only the subject of the image (common to all human experience) but also the epic form, the case for direct influence of the epic would be convincing.

The sea as a basis for imagery was, of course, not neglected by the romantic poets. The reader leaves this stimulating work with the feeling that the terms "epic imagery" and "romantic" need further clarifying.

STITH THOMPSON

Indiana University

Letters of Robert Carter 1720-1727. The Commercial Interests of a Virginia Gentleman. Edited by LOUIS B. WRIGHT. San Marino, California. The Huntington Library, 1940. Pp. xiv + 153. \$2.50.

The student of the social and economic history of colonial Virginia will welcome the publication of these letters of Robert Carter. A part (the remainder has been lost or destroyed) of the commercial correspondence of a Virginia tobacco planter, the letters provide valuable information about the business practices of a period for which source material is not only scarce but often inaccessible.

Robert Carter was known to his contemporaries as "King" Carter because of his wealth, power, and pride. That he should have achieved such a position of prominence is attested by these letters; they reveal him to be a man of more than ordinary business ability. The correspondence that is here for the first time printed is that which passed between Carter and his agents abroad. The services rendered by these agents included the sale abroad of his tobacco (shipped to them on consignment), the investment of his surplus funds, the purchase of supplies, and supervision of the education of his sons in England. The letters provide interesting detail of the manner in which these functions were performed. Carter complains often of the delay in the sale of his tobacco, of the low prices at which it is sold, and of the high cost of freight. Yet on the whole his dealings with his agents were highly profitable, when he died he left an estate said to consist of 300,000 acres of land, about 1000 slaves, and £10,000 in cash. There is reason to think, too, that his agents reaped tidy profits.

Not all of the correspondence, however, has to do with business problems. Carter writes of his convictions concerning religion, avowing that he has no use for "the high-flown up top notions and the great stress that is laid upon ceremonies". His concern over the education of his sons is also indicated in his letters. He has our sympathy when we learn that his sons were not always attentive to their studies nor economical in their expenses!

These letters, in short, afford a valuable insight into the life of a prominent Virginia aristocrat. The volume has a useful introduction from the pen of the editor; there is also an adequate index. The manuscripts, moreover, have been expertly edited, and the printer for his part has done an excellent job.

HAROLD H. HUTCHESON

The Johns Hopkins University

BRIEF MENTION

Classical Influence upon the Tribe of Ben A Study of Classical Elements in the Non-Dramatic Poetry of Ben Jonson and His Circle By KATHRYN ANDERSON MCEUEN Cedar Rapids, Iowa: The Torch Press, 1939. Pp. xx + 316. In this book, an apparent Columbia doctoral thesis, Mrs. McEuen studies the influence of Martial, Juvenal, Persius, Horace, Propertius, Tibullus, Ovid, Catullus, Theocritus, Vergil, Anacreon, and the poets of the Anthology on Carew, Corbet, Cartwright, Falkland, Howell, Lovelace, Randolph, Suckling, Herrick, and Jonson. The result of this investigation is a series of chapters named for the classical poets and containing parallels between their work and that of the Jonsonian school. The work is fearfully thorough. All that has been thought and said in the world about this problem together with new findings by the author is included within the boards of this study. As Mrs. McEuen undoubtedly knew before she wrote out her first reference cards, the general conclusions of her work had long been known to scholars, her study becomes, then, a sort of omnium gatherum where future editors of these poets may dip for annotations.

The usual dissertation diseases are present. The reader is overwhelmed with proofs and illustrations—if a poet made a translation from Ovid, we are offered the translation and the original text. As usual, one finds too many general truths offered as specific influences, the late Professor Dodge's essay on parallel passages should be the required reading of all graduate students and their professors. These faults are, however, found in every thesis. My chief regret is that Mrs. McEuen, who is a good Latinist and a painstaking scholar, was not assigned a topic with more interest in it. She might, for example, have done something with the editions of the classics known to Jonson's circle and told us about the influence of commentaries, prefatory essays, and corrupt texts. To this she could have added a study of the influence of contemporary treatises on classical metrics or works like Casaubon's study of satire. Finally, she might have studied the neo-Latin poets who followed the classic theme and who are, I think, often more important for "classical influences" on vernacular poets than the ancients themselves.

DON CAMERON ALLEN

Duke University

Elizabethan Music and Musical Criticism. By MORRISON COMEGYS BOYD. Philadelphia. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1940. Pp. xii + 364 \$3.50 The title of this book is perhaps misleading, since Dr. Boyd explains in his preface that his original intention was to discuss only the musical criticism of the Elizabethans. The introduction of six chapters describing the various kinds of music and listing the composers has quite changed the nature of his work as now presented. These chapters are biographical in form and contain only very brief discussion of the music itself. As a result of this brevity, those readers who are anxious to have anything more than a very superficial account will be disappointed and will in some sections find even this superficial account unsatisfactory. This is particularly true of the section on the masque. Also, in dealing with the madrigal, Mr. Boyd mentions Yonge's *Musica Transalpina* (1588) but does not indicate its importance in introducing the Italian madrigal to England. In spite of the brevity of his treatment of Elizabethan music, we may well be glad that the author made over his book into an outline history. By doing so he has given us a very complete up-to-date compilation of the facts about the composers, the original editions of their works, and the modern books and articles about them. From this point of view his work deserves high praise and will be very useful to students of both music and literature. For a comprehensive and illuminating treatment of Elizabethan music, adequately illustrated with specimens, we must still wait.

LEICESTER BRADNER

Brown University

The Pastoral Elegy An Anthology. Edited with introduction, commentary, and notes, by THOMAS P. HARRISON, JR. English translations by HARRY JOSHUA LEON. Austin. University of Texas, 1939. Pp. xii + 312. \$2.50 Pastoral poetry, especially the elegy, is the expression of an enduring point of view—that of the supposedly simple, but really ironic, “shepherd,” who comments, in a variety of forms, upon the badness of the times, the pains of love, the beauty of the earth, and who voices the bitter frustration felt by men of good will whenever a youth of intellectual promise is cut off by accidental or unheroic death. These things will continue, with the seasons. But now that all traditional genres are mixed or lost, the pastoral elegy seems at once the best-defined and most archaic of literary forms, and any collection such as Mr. Harrison's must appear a bit “mortuary.” His is a very useful volume, however, simply because it is a well-edited anthology of a form which has recurred throughout some twenty centuries. Placing in chronological order both the best-known examples—Theocritus, Virgil, *Lycidas*, *Adonais*, *Thyrsis*—and the relatively unknown or inaccessible or minor ones, Mr. Harrison

makes a real contribution to comparative literature. His introduction, on the classical, the medieval and the renaissance pastoral, with their "aftermath," is a clear summary of several complex chapters in literary history which should be of use to students, especially to those of Milton and Spenser. The commentary and notes on such writers as Petrarch, Castiglione, and Marot are of like value, while the sections on the medieval pastoral are of interest if only because few general readers know of its existence.

Hollins College

MARY PARMENTER

The Viking and the Red Man, the Old Norse Origin of the Algonquin Language. By REIDER T. SHERWIN. New York and London Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1940. Pp xxvi + 340. That laymen with a smattering of foreign languages at their command are liable to be bitten by the etymological bug is nothing out of the ordinary. Neither is it unusual to find Americans of Scandinavian descent interested in possible traces of Leif the Lucky's famous but hapless expedition to the mainland of America, but, unfortunately, this interest when left to roam unguided by the few solid facts of the Sagas has been productive of more bunk than reasoned research, witness the voluminous writings on the Kensington stone and the Beardmore finds. In view of this Mr. Reider T. Sherwin's attempt to prove the "Old Norse Origin of the Algonquin Language" is not strange, neither is it strange, considering his self-made linguistic method, that he succeeds in finding a thousand or more parallels. With the same method he could have derived Algonquin from Hebrew or from English, and with equally good results.

What does seem strange, however, is the fact that the publishers of the *Funk and Wagnalls Standard Dictionaries* (edited, we are told on the blurb of this book, by over 380 of the world's leading philologists, lexicographers and expert authorities in every branch of knowledge) should have wanted to add this item to their list of reputable works on language. Anyway, this association certainly does not detract from the curiosity value of the book.

STEFÁN EINARSSON

CORRESPONDENCE

SCORSONÈRE, 'salsifs noir' M. Bruce A. Morrisette (*PMLA*, LV, 602) atteste ce mot pour la première fois en France dans une nouvelle historique de Mme de Villegieu en 1670, donc dix ans avant le premier témoignage connu jusqu'ici (1680; Richelet) et le terme espagnol correspondant *escuerçonera* chez un historien des Indes, Nicolás Monardes en 1565 (il faut corriger 1585 au bas de la p 604) Le mot serait emprunté, non pas à

l'italien (opinion de Richelet, Bloch, Gamillschag—M. Morristette a tort de dire que les auteurs modernes répètent l'étymologie italienne de Meyer-Lubke, puisque le REW¹ ne contient même pas le mot), mais au catalan, dont les formes italienne, française et espagnole seraient dérivées. Mattioli et Covarrubias ainsi que Jault (1750) indiquent en effet une origine catalane.

Je n'objecterai rien à l'étymologie catalane en tant que dernière source du mot, particulièrement (puisque le suffixe *-era* pourrait aussi bien être espagnol) parce que le cat. *escorço* 'vipère' = **ex-curtio*, *onis* me semble le représentant catalan autochtone, tandis que l'Espagne a plutôt *escuerzo* = **ex-curtius*—comme le cat. *corgó* 'chevreuil' = *curtio* s'oppose à l'esp. *corzo* id. REW 2419. La forme *escuerçonera* de Monardes même (au lieu de *escorzonera*) montre une tentative d'adaptation à l'esp. *escuerzo*. Mais le fr. *scorzonère* est, de par son *s-*, non *es-*, évidemment, quoique en dise M. M., un italianisme. Le catalan *escorçonera* (j'ajoute attesté par le Diccionari Aguiló dans un *Libre de la Peste* que je ne puis dater, mais qui semble assez ancien) a donc d'abord été emprunté par l'espagnol, puis par l'italien,¹ puis par le français. Il faut soigneusement distinguer ces étapes, démontrées aussi par les dates respectives des mots, et établir une filiation, non pas catalan > espagnol, italien et français, mais catalan > espagnol > italien > français.

Pour l'*s* initial du cat. *escorço* il ne faut invoquer ni *scortea* avec Meyer-Lubke, ni *scorpio* avec M. Morristette,² mais simplement le *ea-* du verbe **excurtare*, 'raccourcir' (REW 2994 it. *scorciare*, esp. port. prov. *escorçar*), qui se trouve parallèlement dans les dérivés de *curtus* (REW 2421 ital. *scorto*), et dans ceux de *curtare* qui ont d'autres significations (serbocroate *skrt*, véron *zkuitso* 'avaricieux', a. fr. *escors* 'giron, sein', all. *Schurze* 'tablier'). La forme *escuerzo* avec son *ue* montre bien l'extraction verbale.

M. Morristette va trop loin en admettant que l'ital. *scorzona* 'serpent' dérive aussi du catalan *escorço* : on importe une plante ou un animal dans un autre pays quand ceux-ci peuvent servir l'homme (p. ex. précisément la *scorzonère*), mais a-t-on jamais vu l'importation d'une vipère ou d'un crapaud ?³ Les formes dialectales de la Haute Italie, peut-être de Luques, de Sardaigne, que cite le REW, militent en faveur d'un mot autochtone en Italie et d'ailleurs interroman. Tout au plus pourrait-on noter que la forme florentine *scorzona* est littéraire (la forme normale serait **scorcione*).

Corriger la forme *mordati* dans le passage cité de Mattioli en *morduti*.

LEO SPITZER

¹ Quand l'Italien Mattioli affirme que les vipères sont appelées "in Spagna *scurzi*," ce n'est pas "obviously an italianized plural" du cat. *escorço*, mais le pluriel italianisé de l'esp. *escuerzo* : une italianisation de *escorço* (plur.-*ons*) serait **scorzoni*.

² Caroline Michaelis de Vasconcellos, *ZRPh* xxv, 282 voulait même expliquer *escorço* (et port. *escorção*) par *scorpio* parce que le peuple emploie la *scorzonère* contre la morsure de cet animal.

³ Et il ne s'agit pas non plus dans ce cas d'un animal réputé caractéristique d'une certaine région, comme pour le *cobra*, la *tarentule* etc.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received]

Alfriend, Edward M. & Wheeler, A. C., Bennett, Clarence, Taylor, Charles A., Mortimer, Lilhan, Woods, Walter. — *The Great Diamond Robbery* and other recent melodramas. Ed. Garrett H. Leverton. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton U Press, 1940. Pp. xvi + 255. \$5.00 (America's Lost Plays, vol. viii).

Elyot, Sir Thomas. — The defence of good women. Edited by Edwin J. Howard. Oxford, Ohio: Anchor Press, 1940. Pp. xvi + 85. \$1.25.

Fricker, Robert. — Das historische Drama in England von der Romantik bis zur Gegenwart. Bern: A. Francke, [1940]. Pp. vi + 363 (Schweizer Anglistische Arbeiten, 8).

Fries, Charles Carpenter. — American English grammar, the grammatical structure of present-day American English with especial reference to social differences or class dialects. New York: D. Appleton-Century, [1940]. Pp. xii + 313. \$2.50 (National Council of Teachers of English, English Monograph, 10).

Griggs, Earl Leshe. — Coleridge fille, a biography of Sara Coleridge. London [New York]: Oxford U Press, 1940. Pp. xiv + 259. \$3.75.

Haller, Elisabeth. — Die barocken Stilmerkmale in der englischen, lateinischen und deutschen Fassung von Dr. Thomas Burnetts *Theory of the Earth*. Bern: A. Francke, [1940]. Pp. xiv + 179. (Schweizer Anglistische Arbeiten, 9).

Harris, Brice. — Charles Sackville, sixth Earl of Dorset, patron and poet of the Restoration. Urbana, Ill.: U of Ill Press, 1940. Pp. 269. \$3.00 and \$3.50 (Ill. Studies in Lang. and Lit., xxvi, 3-4).

Osborn, James M. — John Dryden: some biographical facts and problems. New York: Columbia U Press, 1940. Pp. xiv + 295. \$3.50.

Shakespeare, William. — *The Passionate Pilgrim*, the third edition, 1612, reproduced in facsimile from the copy in the Folger Shakespeare Library, with an introduction by Hyder E. Rollins. New York: Scribner's, 1940. Pp. xlii + 136.

GERMAN

Anlauf, Karl. — Der Philosoph von Wiedensahl. Der volkische Seher Wilhelm Busch. Berlin: Buchergilde Gutenberg [1939]. 195 pp.

Blochwitz, Werner. — Die germanischen Ortsnamen im Departement Ardennes. Ein Beitrag zur Frage der Frankensiedlung in Nordfrankreich. Diss. Leipzig [Aus: Volkstum u. Kultur der Romanen Jg. 12, H. 1-2]. Hamburg: Augustin, 1939. 168 pp.

Blumohr, Fritz Peter. — Die Flurnamen von Neustadt im Odenwald. Der Flurnamenbestand als Raumbild. Diss. [Hessisches Flurnamenbuch H. 15]. Marburg: Elwert, 1939. 76 pp., 10 plates. M. 3.

Drerup, Engelbert. — Aus versunkenen Tagen. Jugenderinnerungen. [Rhetorische Studien Erg. Bd. 2]. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1939. 299 pp. M. 6.

Drissen, Alfred. — Das Sprachgut des Markschneiders. Wegweiser für Landmesser, Berg- und Vermessungsbeamte. 2. verm. u. verb. Aufl. Recklinghausen: Selbstverl. [1939]. 112 p. 4°. M. 5.80.

Jordan, Maria. — Die Romane Bruno Willes. [Diss., bearb. von Prof. Reinhard Strecker.] Berlin: Neuland-Verlagsges. 1939. 107 pp.

Koch, Georg. — Die Heimkehr des Ernst Moritz Arndt. Berlin: Eckart-Verl. 1939. 187 pp. M. 2.85.

Koller, Georg. — Der Beruf des Skalden. Diss. Berlin: Pflaum, 1939. 99 pp.

Kreller, Alois. — Wortgeographie des Schönhengster Landes. Mit 42 Karten. [Arbeiten zur sprachlichen Volksforschung in den Sudetenländern. H. 6]. Leipzig: Rohrer, 1939. xi, 122 pp. M. 8.50.

Langenbacher, Hellmuth. — Deutsche Dichtung in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart. Eine Einführung mit ausgewählten Textproben. 2. durchges. Aufl. Berlin: Bong. [1939]. 443 pp. M. 4.80.

Losch, Philipp. — Altkasseler und althessische Familiennamen. Ein Register zu Stölzels Casseler Stadtrechnungen 1468 bis 1553. [Aus: Zs. d. Ver. f. hess. Gesch. u. Landeskunde N. F. Suppl. 3 = Nachrichten d. Ges. f. Familienkunde in Kurhessen u. Waldeck 1939, Sonderbeilage]. [Kassel:] 1939. 19 pp.

Oberheiden, Anneliese. — Haltung und Weitung der deutschen Frau im erzählenden Schrifttum der Gegenwart. Diss. Greifswald. Würzburg: K. Triltsch, 1939. 155 pp.

Parske, Richard. — J. W. v. Goethe und das Porzellan. Mit 33 Abbildungen. Berlin: Verl. f. Auswärtige Politik [1940]. 56 pp. M. 3.

Reisinger, Hedwig. — Michel Georg Conrad. Ein Lebensbild mit besonderer Berücksichtigung seiner Tätigkeit als Kritiker. Diss. München: Würzburg: Mayr, 1939. 94 pp.

Roberts, Cecil E. — Handwerk und Handwerker in der deutschen Erzählung vom Ausgang des 18. Jhs. bis zur Gegenwart. Diss. Breslau: 1939. Vater. 109 pp.

Schneider, Gertrud.—*Personlichkeit und Gemeinschaft bei Emil Strauss* Diss *Wurzburg*: Mayr, 1939 84 pp

Scholz, Wilhelm von—*An Ilm und Isar Lebenserinnerungen Mit 8 Tiefdrucktafeln* *Leipzig* P. List [1939] 318 pp M 6 80

Schwab, Rudolf—*Meinad Lienerts geschichtliche Dichtung Entstehung und Quellen* *Bern*. Haupt, 1940. 127 pp Fr 4

Strauss, Emil—*Johann Peter Hebbel Leben und Briefe* [Die kleine Bucherei 225] *München* Albert Langen, 1939 74 pp 80 Pf

Weithase, Irmgard.—*Von der Schönheit und Eigenart der deutschen Sprache* [Aus *Thüringer Volksbildungsarbeit*] *Possneck*. Fr Gerold, 1940 26 pp 75 Pf

Zahrenhusen, Hinrich—*Ostfriesische Vornamen Die in Ostfriesland gebräuchlichen Rufnamen Zusammenestellt und auf der Grundlage der german Namenbildung bearb. Mit einem Anhang Verz guter ostfries Vornamen* Hrsg von der Ostfries Landschaft in Aurich [*Emden* Haynell], 1939 143 pp M 3

FRENCH

Baudoun, A.—*Jacques Abbadie, Prediger der franz Gemeinde zu Berlin, in der Geschichte der franz Lit Berlin diss*, 1939 v + 55 pp

Blochowitz, W.—*Die german Ortsnamen im Dep. Ardennes* *Leipzig* diss, 1939 168 pp

Chaigne, Louis—*Notre littérature d'aujourd'hui* *Paris*: J. de Gigord, 1939. 132 pp Fr. 7.50

Finch, David—*La Critique philosophique de Pascal au XVIII^e s.* U of Pa. diss, 1940 84 pp

Frey, D. E.—*Le Genre élégiaque dans l'œuvre de Ronsard* *Basel* diss, 1939 115 pp

Guyer, F. E.—*A Short Fr Grammar for college students* *New York*: Harper, 1940 xvi + 189 pp. \$1.20.

Hilton, G. R.—*The Social Importance of the Machine as seen in Nineteenth Century Fr Lit* *Abstr. of U of Ill* diss, 1940 15 pp

Irvin, L. P. and King, D. L.—*Lectures intermédiaires* *New York*: Harper, 1940 xii + 531 pp \$1 80

Kenéz, E.—*Le problème du style dans la critique romantique (1815-30)* *Budapest* Inst. fr. à l'univ, 1939 55 pp.

Korrodi, E.—*Zeit u. Bewegung im franz Abenteuerroman des 20. Jhr.* *Zürich* diss 1939 110 pp

Lesage, L.—*Jean Giraudoux's Use of the Metaphor.* *Abstr. of U. of Ill* diss, 1940. 10 pp.

Maurois et Chevrillon.—*Discours de réception à l'Acad. fr. et Réponse.* *Paris*: Grasset, 1939. 133 pp. Fr. 18

Maurras et Bordeaux.—*Discours de réception à l'Acad. fr. et Réponse* *Paris*: Pion, 1939 135 pp Fr 15

Molière.—*Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, éd. Gonzague Truc *Paris* J. de Gigord, 1939 112 pp Fr 2 50

Pellegrini, C.—*Storia della letteratura francese* *Messina* Principato, 1939 487 pp

Proszwimmer, Kl.—*La litt. enfantine en Fr. au XVIII^e s. et au commencement du XIX^e* *Budapest*: Inst. fr. à l'Univ, 1939 108 pp

Röbert, Ella.—*Rousseau et la musique* *Budapest*: Inst. fr. à l'Univ, 1939 80 pp

Spitzer, Marthe—*Les Juifs de Balzac* *Budapest*: Inst. fr. à l'Univ, 1940 84 pp

Weck, René de.—*Souvenirs littéraires* *Paris*: Mercure de France, 1939 219 pp Fr 15

ITALIAN

Alfieri, L.—*G. B. Niccolini tragedia del risorgimento italiano* *Milano* Zucchi, 1939 140 pp

Battisti, C. e Montecchini, M.—*I nomi locali della Pusteria. Parte II. La giurisdizione di Brunico* *Firenze*. Rinascimento del Libro, 1939 399 pp.

Carinci, N.—*Il Paradiso terrestre nella Divina Commedia.* *Lavagna*: tip. Artigianelli, 1939 65 pp

Christ, Salome.—*Jacob Burckhard u. die Poesie der Italiener* *Basel*: Helbing u. Lichtenhahn, 1940 208 pp

Corti, Maria.—*Studi sulla latinità merovingia.* *Messina*: Principato, 1939

De Robertis, Giuseppe.—*Scrittori del Novecento* *Firenze* Le Monnier, 1940

Simone, A.—*Il Canzoniere di M. M. Boiardo* *Biella*: Sateb, 1939 133 pp.

Trevisani, F. M.—*La Cristina* Tragedia inedita, con notizie sulla vita e sulle opere dell'autore, a cura di Michele De Filippis. *Berkeley*. University of California Press, 1940 (Univ. of California Publications in Modern Philology, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 277-376) \$1 00

Vollmer, E.—*Neapel u. seine Menschen in der Schilderung von Matilde Serao. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des regionalistischen Romans in Italien* (Diss. Marburg) *Hamburg*: Hans Gildenverlag, 1939 113 pp

SPANISH

Rojas, Augustín de.—*El natural desdichado*, ed. J. W. Crowell *New York*. Inst. de las Españas, 1939. lxxi + 201 pp

Vega, Lope de.—*El palacio confuso, together with a Study of the Menaechmi theme in Sp. lit.* *New York*: Inst. de las Españas, 1939 xcii + 138 pp.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LVI

APRIL, 1941

Number 4

THE COMPOSITION OF ANATOLE FRANCE'S *L'ORME DU MAIL*

It is a stock criticism of Anatole France that he never wrote an entire book of better than mediocre composition. Some have said that his faulty composition was the result of his lack of a sustaining creative imagination, others, that he was simply too lazy or too careless to plan an architecturally constructed book. So far as I know, however, no study has been made to show how a book grew under the hand of Anatole France and also to indicate actual flaws in its composition.¹ This article is an attempt to trace some of the steps in the development of *L'Orme du mail*, the first of the four volumes of the *Histoire Contemporaine*, to point out some of the minor structural flaws which resulted from its complicated history, and to correlate France's writing of the book with the events of his own life.² By its very nature this study cannot be complete; some of it must be conjectural and much will remain problematical, to be clarified definitely only when more of Anatole France's correspondence has been published.

It is safe to say that none of France's works was less planned in advance than his *Histoire Contemporaine*. The series of articles which constitute it began on January 22, 1895, under the title

¹ Charles Braibant in *Du Boulangisme au Panama Le Secret d'Anatole France* (Paris, 1935), p. 116 and *passim*, pointed out the influence of *le boulangisme* on France's works, E. Preston Dargan in *Anatole France* (New York, 1937), pp. 441-461, discusses France's treatment of the Thais story.

² Some of the statements in this article are based upon data which I have already published in "Notes on Historical References in Anatole France's *L'Orme du mail*," *MP*, August, 1940, pp. 73-83, parts of the earlier article are pertinent here but I shall not repeat them.

Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques.³ From that time until November 3, 1896, France published twenty-seven articles.⁴ Before January 13, 1897, he chose twenty-six of these articles, deleted some pages and added others, and made radical changes in the order of the articles to form the volume whose first edition appeared on that date. In order to make a volume of these articles France had to make more alterations than in any of his other books which had first appeared serially.

In the articles for the first volume of the *Histoire Contemporaine* France was seeking his way. *L'Orme du mail* has fewer and weaker threads to hold it together than the other three volumes, though certainly none of the four has real unity in the usual sense of the word. The second volume has more unity, perhaps because it was written in less time; for by then the author had found his way.⁵ Soon after the beginning of the third volume Anatole France entered, at first rather mildly, the Dreyfus struggle. This theme is the main thread of the third and fourth volumes.

Seven of the twenty-seven articles of *L'Orme du mail* appeared in 1895, the remainder in 1896.⁶ The rivalry between Lantaigne and Gutrel for the bishopric of Tourcoing is the link which binds together these seven articles.⁷ As early as these first articles it

³ This rubric is a tongue-in-cheek reminiscence of the Jansenist periodical published under the same title in the eighteenth century.

⁴ All bibliographical data, unless otherwise indicated, are from Anatole France, *Œuvres Complètes*, Carias edition (Paris, 1927), XI, 455-458.

⁵ *Le Mannequin d'osier* tells the story of the disruption of the Bergeret household (i.e., the household of Anatole France).

⁶ Except the short story, *Un Substitut*, of 1894, which France inserted as Chapter XIV

⁷ Carias in *Œuvres Complètes*, XI, 456, says the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, seventh, and tenth chapters appeared in 1895. In *Livres, Manuscrits, Dessins provenant des bibliothèques de Madame Arman de Caillavet et de Madame Gaston de Caillavet, Manuscrits et Lettres d'Anatole France* (Georges Andrieux, expert), (Paris, 1932) the order of Chapters VII and VIII is inverted, putting Chapter VIII in 1895 before the article of Chapter VII which is said to be of 1896. It has been impossible to refer to the original serial edition of the articles which cannot be found in this country. Internal evidence leaves little doubt that the information in *Œuvres Complètes* is correct, for in Chapter VIII, p. 84 of Volume XI, Gutrel tells the prefect, Worms-Clavelin, of the sarcastic remark his rival, Lantaigne, had made in Chapter VII, p. 77, about the archbishop. This incident seems not to be a later addition.

becomes quite apparent that Lantaigne has no chance to get the coveted bishopric. The reader is led to expect a quick resolution of the struggle by the success of Guitrel. Certainly there is nothing in the plot to indicate that even the author realized Guitrel would have to wait until the end of the third volume to gain the bishopric.

When Anatole France began to write *Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques*, his general subject, the satirical treatment of ecclesiastical intrigues, was apparently clear in his mind. In the seven articles of 1895 there are notably few elements which do not pertain rather directly to the contest for the bishopric, the main foreign element being the article which forms Chapter x, the last article before an interruption of twelve months in the publication of the articles. Chapter x contains a typical dialogue on Jeanne d'Arc which will be considered in greater detail in another part of this study.⁸

In the later articles, those of 1896, various motifs appear which have little relation with the original plot, but which simply by force of repetition tend to produce a factitious sort of unity. Such motifs are Paillot's bookshop and its *coin des bouquins*, the widow Houssieu, the scabrous Tricouillard allusions, etc. The later development of the articles in 1896 gives no indication that their trend had been planned in 1895.

A bare enumeration of the shifts that France made to rearrange the articles into volume form suffices to prove that he could not have planned the book. The first five chapters comprise the five articles which appeared from January 22 to March 26, 1895. Chapter vi consists of three articles which appeared from May 24 to June 9, 1896, fourteen months later than Chapter v. For Chapter vii France cast back to the article of March 5, 1895. The article of May 17, 1896, forms Chapter viii, it appeared fourteen months after Chapter vii. Chapter ix, the article of April 21, 1896, appeared some twelve months after Chapter x, the article of April 2, 1895. Two articles constitute Chapter xi, those of May 5 and May 12, 1896. France formed Chapters xii and xiii of the six articles which were published consecutively from June 23 to July 28, 1896. In Chapter xiv is the story *Un Substitut* which had been published in December, 1894. Chapter xv consists of the articles of August 4 and August 25, 1896, and Chapter xvi of those of October 27

⁸ For further details concerning this dialogue on Jeanne d'Arc see the article to which I referred in note 2, above, pp. 75-79.

and November 3, 1896 France again broke the order of the articles by taking that of September 8, 1896 to make Chapter xvii.

That confusing jumble of interwoven dates and the discrete elements in the book show how little importance can be attached to the plot of *L'Orme*, and indicate clearly that none of it had been planned beyond the first few articles

The complicated reorganization of the articles for the edition of 1897 produced some minor errors in the structure of *L'Orme*. Since *L'Orme du mail* was a book on contemporary events, the chronology of those events coincided rather well with that of the composition of the articles, for the events were usually transplanted into the articles soon after their occurrence. The dismemberment of this chronology in the rearrangement of the articles to make the book inevitably presented problems of synchronization. Since France, with his customary carelessness in such trivia, did not solve all these problems correctly, certain errors of chronology resulted. I shall point out only a few of them

The story starts in the spring or summer, for on p. 38 we read: "Cette année-là, un jour d'été, M. Guitrel . . . trouva dans le magasin M. Worms-Clavelin. . . ." That must be the summer of 1896, since this contemporary chronicle was published in January, 1897. On p. 71 the meadows are still green, and shortly afterward we hear Lantaigne and Bergeret converse on the mail " . . . selon leur coutume d'été." A few pages further the lilacs are still blooming;⁹ then suddenly Dr. Fornerol tells us it is now 1897,¹⁰ though at the beginning of the next chapter the sun still shines glaringly and " . . . un cantonnier dormait au fond du fossé. . . ." ¹¹ Three chapters later, in Chapter xvi, the prefect goes hunting at Valcombe ¹² This places the time in September or soon thereafter, as the hunting season opened in the first week of September.¹³

This cavalier disregard for the normal order of the seasons is explained by the times at which these chapters were written. The first four references above, all of which indicate the setting is in spring or summer, are from articles written, respectively, on March 12 and March 5, in April and in May, though the first three articles are of 1895 and the last is of 1896. Fornerol's definite men-

⁹ Anatole France, *op cit*, xi, 109

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 143

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 131

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 197.

¹³ *L'Illustration*, No. 106, September 7, 1895, p. 194

tion of the date 1897 is in an article of June or July 1896.¹⁴ The next two references are of July, 1896. The allusion to the prefect's hunting is of October 27, 1896; therefore his hunt was, as originally conceived by the author, in season and legal. Of course France named the year 1897 to bring his contemporary history up to date with the first edition of 1897. But there is no attempt to synchronize with reality the references in *L'Orme* to the seasons, and consequently the book seems to be laid in a land of eternal spring and summer.

Another discrepancy in time is noticed when Worms-Clavelin remarks that now, when the Tsar is about to visit France, the Republic must identify itself with the upper classes and put them in contact with Russia.¹⁵ In reality Nicholas II disembarked at Cherbourg on October 5, 1896.¹⁶ The articles of this Chapter XVI were published on October 27 and November 3, 1896. To one who read the *articles* in the *Echo de Paris* the flavor of contemporaneity was distinct. But to one who read the *book* in 1897 it must have seemed strange to find that Fornerol gave the date of action as 1897, some seventy pages *before* the prefect said the Tsar was *about* to visit France, for actually the Tsar had come and departed before that time.

In the first edition of *L'Orme* Bergeret was said to have three daughters.¹⁷ In *Le Mannequin d'osier*, however, France wrote that Juliette, the younger of the *two* daughters, went with her mother when she left Bergeret.¹⁸ The error was corrected in the revision of 1923, in which we are told to begin with that Bergeret has two daughters.¹⁹

Certain additions had to be made to the articles in their rearrangement to gain greater coherency for the volume of 1897. Besides marginal emendations, there were two major additions. One is Chapter XIV, the short, satirical *Un Substitut* of 1894, which was added to *L'Orme* because the point of the story is exactly in har-

¹⁴ The date 1897 was inserted in the reorganization for the edition of 1897.

¹⁵ Anatole France, *op cit*, XI, 205

¹⁶ *Le Temps*, October 7, 1896

¹⁷ Anatole France, *L'Orme du mail* (Paris, January, 1897), p. 239

¹⁸ Anatole France, *Œuvres Complètes*, Carias edition (Paris, 1927), XI, 452

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 159.

mony with Bergeret's opinions on government, and probably also because France needed to fill out his book. To form a frame for that political apologue France wrote eight pages in-folio and distributed seven of them at the beginning and end of Chapter XIV. The eighth page forms the beginning of Chapter XV.²⁰ It is obvious where the additions begin and end.

The other major addition is in Chapter X. This chapter on Jeanne d'Arc is the article of April 2, 1895, the last before the article of April 21, 1896. Anatole France was incited to resume the theme of Jeanne d'Arc some twelve months later because during those twelve months a replica of her had appeared in Paris. To assure that the reader would project the modern charlatan's faults into the figure of Jeanne d'Arc, France wrote three articles in succession which he arranged skilfully as a frame for Chapter X. The first of these articles of 1896 he put in Chapter IX, and the other two comprise Chapter XI. France wrote two and a half pages in-folio at the end of Chapter X to form the transition between the prophetesses. When Bergeret calls Jeanne d'Arc "une mascotte," Lantaigne fails to hear him and offers a resounding prophecy on the Christian mission of France. "Aussi, répliqua M. Bergeret, voyons-nous paraître des prophétesses . . .," and the conversation then turns for one page to Claude Deniseau, forming an unsavory parallel with Jeanne d'Arc.²¹ This page and a half, although written more than a year after Chapter X, thus neatly bridges the gap between the two prophetesses.

Again it seems clear that Anatole France in 1895, when he began the series of articles named *Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques*, had no conception that they would expand into four volumes of *Histoire Contemporaine*.

The character whose growth testifies most fully to the unexpected development of the *Histoire Contemporaine* is Professor Bergeret. He is introduced with comparatively little characterization in Chapter VII. It is only little by little that Bergeret comes to be identified with his creator during the latter part of *L'Orme*, but particularly in *Le Mannequin d'osier*, which is largely the story of Anatole France himself. In *L'Anneau d'améthyste* France, as if Bergeret and he were only one person suffering from schizophrenia

²⁰ *Livres, Manuscrits, etc.*, pp. 105-106

²¹ Anatole France, *op cit*, XI, 105-6

(and in a sense they are), moved the professor nearer to his author by promoting him and bringing him to Paris. There France could use him more effectively in his campaign for Dreyfus. This identification of Bergeret with Anatole France becomes so complete in the last two volumes that the author seems to forget he has been using the professor as a mouthpiece for his sentiments and, with no warning transition, Anatole France speaks directly for himself²²

It is impossible to offer certain proof in such a question, but the evidence indicates that none but the first few of these articles had been conceived before the series was started in 1895. The same evidence may help explain the hiatus of nearly thirteen months in the appearance of the articles, from April 2, 1895, to April 21, 1896.²³ It may be true, in conformance with the only explanation of this interruption so far proffered, that France ceased publication of his distinctly irreligious articles in order to grease the ways for launching himself into the Academy. That hypothesis can neither be proved nor disproved fully until more of his correspondence is known. France was elected to the French Academy on January 30, 1896, and was received into it on December 24, 1896.²⁴ It seems doubtful whether deference to the clerical members of the Academy could have deterred him for three months (from January 30 to April 21) from resuming the series if he had been eager to do it.

Another explanation seems more satisfactory. We have seen how amorphous in France's mind was the original conception of the articles. Proust gave evidence of this aimlessness of the series when he wrote to France.

Puis il y eut cette chose dont on ne savait pas d'abord si elle était une personne qui aurait sa permanence et son identité et qu'on appelait dans ce doute 'L'article de *l'Echo*.' Et bientôt on put l'appeler les Bergeret.
...²⁵

It seems at least probable, then, that France quit the articles in April, 1895, simply because he had no particular subject to attract

²² The first example of this personal intervention of France seems to be in *L'Anneau d'améthyste*. See Anatole France, *op cit*, XII, 183-184.

²³ See the chronological table of the articles. *Ibid*, XI, 455-458.

²⁴ E. P. Dargan, *Anatole France* (New York, 1937), pp. 596-610.

²⁵ J. M. Pouquet, *Le Salon de Madame Arman de Caillavet* (Paris, 1926), pp. 193-194.

him and resumed them in April, 1896, as soon as the appearance of the seeress, Henriette Couédon, had given him an ideal subject to weave around his article on Jeanne d'Arc.

This study of the composition of *L'Orme du mail* leads us to two conclusions: when Anatole France began the articles called *Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques*, he had planned only the first six or seven of them and did not know they would extend into four volumes of *Histoire Contemporaine*, the interruption of thirteen months in the appearance of the articles of *L'Orme* was probably due to the lack of a piquant subject, rather than to the author's election to the Academy.

D. L. HAMILTON

U S Naval Academy

VERSIONS BY SKELTON, CAXTON, AND BERNERS OF A PROLOGUE BY DIODORUS SICULUS

Caxton for the first three fourths of his prologue to the *Polyconicon*, 1482, and Lord Berners for the first two thirds of his prologue to Froissart's *Chronicles*, 1523, made translations from the first or general *Preface* to the *Library of History* by Diodorus Siculus.¹ This can be shown so readily that there is some wonder it has never been noticed before. The translations are not rigidly close, but close enough that even their sentence-structure is largely based on the source. That the two men translated their prologues without acknowledgement is nothing unusual.² The borrowed generalities upon the moral value of history, commonplaces in

¹ Caxton ed. by W. J. B. Crotch, *The Prologues and Epilogues of William Caxton* (EETS os 176), London, 1928, pp. 64-67. Berners ed. by W. P. Ker, *The Chronicle of Froissart* (Tudor Translations, 27), London, 1901, pp. 3-7. Diodorus ed. by C. H. Oldfather (Loeb Classical Library), London, 1933, I, 4-13.

² Four others of Caxton's prologues are known to contain unavowed translation. (Parallel texts in Crotch, *op. cit.*, pp. 10, 50, 71, 81.) Henry Watson's prologue to *The shyppe of fools*, 1509, was a translation of a translation, carefully altered in the proper names to fit Watson's new purpose. (Quoted by F. A. Pompen, *The English Versions of the Ship of Fools*, London, 1925, p. 282.) And see F. R. Amos, *Early Theories of Translation*, New York, 1920, pp. 43-46, and H. O. White, *Plagiarism and Imitation During the English Renaissance*, Cambridge, Mass., 1935, pp. 38-43.

Diodorus' time and so phrased as to sound commonplace at any time, became standard classical doctrine in Tudor England³, but it is doubtful if their incidental appearance with either the *Poly-cronicon* or the *Froissart* had much to do with implanting them. The chief interest of the common borrowing is in the opportunity to compare procedures of composition. The comparison can be the more telling because John Skelton included the same passage by Diodorus in his translation of the first five books of the *Library*, made not long before 1490.⁴ Furthermore, Berners used the same version of Diodorus as had Skelton, Poggio's Latin translation,⁵ while Caxton used either it or some French derivative of it; and none of the three translators was influenced by either of the others.⁶

Skelton's translation has been known as a vivid exhibition of the aureate style in English; and Caxton's enthusiasm for its 'polysshed and ornate termes,' as well as his restraint in his own practice, is a part of the history of that style.⁷ But Lord Berners' use of the 'termes' has been severely blamed, and his prologue to his translation of Froissart has been made a conspicuous example of the early Tudor polished prologue.⁸ The comparison of these three

³ M. Kunz, *Zur Beurteilung der Prooemien in Diodors Historischer Bibliothek*, Diss., Zurich, 1935, pp. 61-62, 73-82. Lily B. Campbell, ed., *A Murrow for Magistrates*, Cambridge, Mass., 1938, *Int.*, pp. 48-51.

⁴ MS. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 357 (Rotograph No. 29, Library of Congress, Modern Language Deposit), ff. 4r-6r.

⁵ Made in 1449. No modern edition. My quotations are from the edition of Venice, 1476.

⁶ Poggio's differences from Diodorus reappear in both Caxton and Berners. If Caxton used the Latin he translated more freely than I have seen him do elsewhere, including the unavowed matter in his other prologues. The earliest French translation I have found cited, that of Claude de Seyssell, c. 1515, was not made from Poggio (Paulin Paris, *Les MSS Français*, V, 414), but any fifteenth century French compiler or publisher of history may have found Diodorus' generalities as useful as did Caxton and Berners. Independence among the English versions is quickly established by collation.

⁷ H. B. Lathrop, *Translations from the Classics into English from Caxton to Chapman*, Madison, 1933, pp. 26-27.

⁸ W. P. Ker, *op. cit.* *Int.*, pp. xii-xiii, xxxi-xxxii; G. E. B. Samtisbury, *History of English Prose Rhythm*, London, 1912, pp. 94-96; G. P. Krapp, *The Rise of English Literary Prose*, New York, 1915, p. 316; J. A. Gee, *The Life and Works of Thomas Lupset*, New Haven, 1928, pp. 190-191; R. W. Chambers, *The Continuity of English Prose from Alfred to More and his School*, London, 1932, pp. cliv-clv.

men's treatment of the same text shows Caxton, indeed, less expansive and aureate than Skelton, but Berners far least so of all.

But first a description of the make-up of the borrowed prologues. That in Skelton's Diodorus, an avowed translation, is complete. Both Caxton and Berners, following their own purposes, left Diodorus at the point where he became specific about his own history; though at that point they both pretend, like Diodorus, that they were moved to publish or translate their respective chronicles by the preceding considerations of the value of history. The generalities comprise the first 550 words in Poggio's version.⁹ Caxton's first 1150 words, or almost exactly three pages out of four, are translation. He begins on his own with the words,

Thenne syth historye is so precious & also prouffitable / J haue delybered to wryte twoo bookes . . .¹⁰

Near the beginning of the translation there is a passage of about 170 words which is entirely rewritten,¹¹ following the substance from Poggio's version but omitting and substituting many details, and only once reflecting any of the Latin phraseology.¹² Throughout the rest, though there are many changes in phraseology, there are only three additions and seven omissions in the sense, all isolated details.¹³ Berners' first 850 words out of 1200 are translation. He has omitted a final ten words of generality in the Latin, used by Caxton, and beginning with the question,

What knowlege shulde we have of auneynt thynges past, and historie were nat?¹⁴

he has composed about 130 words of epithet, example, and apology apparently of his own. He ends the passage saying "I shall brevely come to a poynt," and the inconsistency of his thereupon resuming generalities is due to his brief return to Poggio for a transition:

⁹ Ff. aii, v-a.iii, v. Diodorus i. 1 2.

¹⁰ P. 66, l. 36

¹¹ P. 64, ll 19-32. Diod i 1 3-4.

¹² " . . . totius orbis velut unus civitatis " : " of alle the worlde as of one Cyte."

¹³ The insertion of Nero as an example of a tyrant (p 65, l 23) is the only change worth mentioning.

¹⁴ P. 5, ll. 18-20.

Advertentes igitur quanta laus scriptoris maneat . .

Thus whan I advertysed and remembered howe laudable and mentoryous
a dede it is to write hystories . .¹⁵

While adding only three details,¹⁶ Berners omits or radically condenses three separate passages from Poggio, of one, four, and two sentences¹⁷, he epitomizes two others, of one sentence each,¹⁸ and he freely re-arranges one other, of two sentences¹⁹

Though less accurate than Skelton's in regard to the Latin constructions, Caxton's translation contains less sheer verbiage. Skelton's whole prologue—apparently the whole translation—is a heap of circumlocutions, some of them modest, many amazing. One could almost believe it to be a parody of the aureate style²⁰ Caxton has used some periphrasis, but much of his redundancy consists of doublets and other small pleonasm, and while the cumulative effect is decidedly aureate, there remains a measurable difference from the aureate language of Skelton. For instance, between Caxton's "conseruatryce and kepar"²¹ and Skelton's "chief defensyf wardayne & contynuel preserver," for *custodem*, there is, of course, the difference of sheer quantity. But frequently it is more than that: between "vnlernd and brutyssh peple" by Caxton²² and "alle other that bereyn be & naked of doctryne" by Skelton, both for *indoctis*, the difference becomes one of kind. For Skelton has used periphrasis, not merely a doublet, and the weight of the verbal group thus formed is that of a sentence-member or

¹⁵ P 5, ll 31, ff.

¹⁶ "a thousande yere" (p. 3, l 18), "four or fyve hundred yere" (p. 4, l 12), and "duke Theseus" (p 4, l 40).

¹⁷ Diod 1. l 2, Caxton p 64, ll 11-14 Diod 1 2 2-4; Caxton p. 65, l 36—p 66, l 7 Diod 1 2 5-6; Caxton p 66, ll 19-25

¹⁸ Berners p 4, l 39—p 5, l 2, Diod 1 2 4, Caxton p 66, ll 11-14. Berners p 5, ll 9-10, Diod 1 2 7, Caxton p 66, ll 27-29

¹⁹ Berners p 4, ll 15-24, Diod 1 1 3 entire, Caxton p 64, ll 19-23 (also freely treated)

²⁰ For instance, "Hercules . . dum vixit" becomes "Hercules whiles he in this lyf present endured" (Caxton, p 66, l 8, "Hercules whan he lyued .", Berners, p 4, l 36, "Hercules . . in his lyfe") "Plurimum proficit ad rectam vitam" becomes "hyghly she profyteth in conductyng us unto the strayt way of sensyble understandyng" (Caxton, p. 66, l. 35, "moche prouffytyn vnto a ryghtful lif", Berners omits)

²¹ P. 66, l. 18.

²² P. 66, l. 22.

colon. Disregarding the recast passage, which is hard to measure, Caxton's translation shows only eleven such verbal groups, whereas in parallel context Skelton has twenty. At the same time, Caxton remains at least equal to Skelton in the form of his sentences. Neither his inaccuracies nor his redundancies cause any broad change from the pattern of sentence-structure laid down by Poggio. With the exceptions just mentioned the number of sentence-members is the same as in Poggio, and their division, order, and inter-relationship are roughly the same, often very nearly the same. Structurally the prose is firmer, more accurate, and more patterned than that in any of Caxton's original writing. Within this very prologue the difference may be observed, Caxton's typical looseness beginning at the point where he gave over his source and began on his own.²³

Berners most often omitted from, epitomized, or rearranged the context of the source, clearly feeling free to do what he liked. But in 700 of the 850 words he translated the sentence-structure is closely based upon that in Poggio, usually more closely than Caxton's translation. The real firmness of his sentences, and their variety and aptness, are likely to be overlooked because of his famous strings of synonyms.²⁴ Doublets, however, are practically his only form of aureate language, more conspicuous because his phraseology is in other ways terse and direct. He has made only five verbal groups of the kind described above in Skelton, and only two of these seem more amplified than is natural to open translation.²⁵ The most pervasive element in the aureate style—and the most vitiating—was periphrasis. It must be noted of Berners, who

²³ For this reason I had suspected that the first three pages of this prologue are translation for some time before I realized what is the source.

²⁴ The clumsiness of the sentence quoted by Gee, *loc cit.*, came about when Berners got lost in his Latin, the one time in the prologue that he did: "Et enim caetera monumenta ad parum tempus produrant variis casibus disturbata . historiae virtus pro universum orbem diffusa ipsum . quod caetera consumit . tempus custodem sui habet." Cf. Berners p 5, ll 2-7.

²⁵ "probos" : "suche as ben noble and vertuous" (p 5, l 16); "improbos" : "suche as ben wicked, yvell, and reprovab" (p 5, l 17). The others (p. 3, l. 12, p 4, ll 19-20) are of the following order (p. 4, ll. 21-22). "propter laudem . quae mortuos sequitur" . "for the great laude that they have after they ben deed."

was still in the tradition of the fifteenth century, that by minimizing his use of periphrasis he directly differed from his predecessors.

The same difference appears if Berners is compared with other predecessors, with Lydgate, Atkynson, or Barclay, for instance. Poggio's Latin provides an exact basis, however, for a comparison with Skelton and Caxton. The translations of the following passage are as nearly average for all three as can be obtained for paralleling

Demique litterarum monumentis quae testimonium virtuti praebent moti quidam tum condidere civitates tum leges utiles vitae mortalium ediderunt Nonnulli novarum artium doctrinarumque inventores ad usum gentium extitere Sed omnium rerum. quibus faelicitas hominis paratur laudem praecipuam causamque historiae tribui decet Est enim custos eorum quae cum virtute acta sunt testem se malefactis benificamque erga omne genus hominum praebens.²⁶

Skelton And some thurgh the motyf of litterature whiche maketh a due probate & testymonye moeved / have as wel edyfied famous cytees / as they have assigned laudable decrees & grounded lawes unto the behoef of mannes temporal lyf / And some by crafty invencion of new faittes & doctryne have founde benefycial pollicyes for the wele in comyn / But the singular laude & comendacion in especyall of alle mater / wher thurgh worldly welth may be enjoyed / & the most chier & soverayn causatyf thereof / ought to be ascribed unto historyal processe / It is the sure garnyson of alle suche thyngis that by vertue be wrought & perfourmed / offryng hym self in testimonial unto mysghyded & undisposed persones / Exhibytyng hym self bounteous toward alle maner of people²⁷

Caxton Truly many of hye and couragious men of grete empayse / desyryng theyr fame to be perpetuelly conseruyd by lyberal [sic] monumentis / whiche ben the permanente recordes of euery vyrtuose and noble Acte / haue buylded and edefied ryall and noble Cytees / And for the conseruacion of the wele publycke haue mynystred and establysshed dyscrete and prouffitable lawes / And thus the pryncipal laude / and cause of delectable and amyable thynges / in whiche mannes felycyte stondesth and resteth ought and maye wel be attributed to hystories / whiche worde historye may be descryued thus / Historye is a perpetuel conseruatryce of thoos thynges / that haue be doone before this presente tyme / and also a cotydyan wytnesse of bienfayttes of malefaytes / grete Actes / and tryumphal vyctoryes of all maner peple²⁸

Berners. So thus, through the monumentes of writynge, which is the testimony unto vertue, many men have ben moved, some to bylde cytes, some to devyse and establishe lawes right profitable, necessarie, and behove-

²⁶ Fol. a111, r Diod i. 2 1-2.

²⁷ Fol. 5, r

²⁸ P. 65, ll. 23-36.

full for the humayne lyfe, some other to fynde new artes, craftes, and sciences, very requisyte to the use of mankynde But above all thynges, wherby mans welthe ryseth, speciaall laude and cause²⁰ ought to be gyven to historie it is the keper of suche thynges as have ben vertuously done, and the wytnesse of yvell dedes and by the benefite of hystorie all noble, highe, and vertuous actes be immortall²⁰

SAMUEL K. WORKMAN

Northwestern University

A METRICAL PUZZLE IN THE *MIRROR FOR MAGISTRATES*

The 1578 edition of the *Mirror for Magistrates* exhibits a large number of textual variants. Like that of 1571, this edition was "newly corrected," with what Miss Lily B. Campbell calls "an enthusiasm for change which it is hard to explain. Very often neither rhyme nor reason is improved by the corrections introduced."¹

Attention has not been called, I think, to a peculiarity in the nature of the 1578 variants in the third tragedy of the *Mirror*, the tragedy of Thomas of Gloucester. As the following scansion shows, in the 1559 edition this poem was written in a loose, alliterative verse of four stresses:

- L 1. Whose státe is stáblisht in sémyng most sùre,
And so fár from dáunger of Fórtunes blást,
24. A more róyall ráce was nót vnder héauen,
More stówte or more státely of stómacke and pérson,

According to the collation in Miss Campbell's edition, the 1578 version of the *Mirror* introduced twenty variants in the two hundred and three lines of this tragedy. Placed beside their originals in earlier editions, all but one of these variants are seen to be, in effect, substitutions of a five-stress line, usually iambic, for an earlier four-stress line.

²⁰ So in Pinson's ed., 1523 Ker emended to *praise*

²⁰ P 4, ll 25-35 The last 14 words are a condensation of 80 words in Poggio following the passage quoted

¹ Lily B. Campbell, ed., *The Mirror for Magistrates* (Cambridge, 1938), p. 18.

- L 1 Whose state stablisht is, in semyng most sure,²
 Who stablisht is in State, seeming most sure,
 10 Addrest in presence his fate to complayne,
 Prest in presence on Fortune to complayne,
 12 Extracte by discent from the royall stocke,
 Who by discent was of the royall stocke,
 64 Thus hoysted so high on Fortunes wheele,
 Thus hoysted high on Fortunes whyrling wheele,
 135 After we had these myracles wrought,
 After we had these Myracles thus wrought,
 137 That to suche bondage he should be brought,
 By Subiectes thus in bondage to bee brought,
 142 with former matter his yre to renue
 with former cause of rancour to renue
 147 Their wages to claime when the town was solde
 To clayme their wages, when the town was solde
 149 Hourded in his harte hate out of measure,
 Fulfyld his hart with hate out of measure,
 152 But loue dayes dissembled do neuer endure,
 But Frendship fayned, in pioofe is found vnure
 158 Where it hath had long season to brewe,
 Where it hath not had long season to brewe,
 170 By reason of syckenes whiche helde me full sore
 With long sicknesse diseased very sore
 172 with whom I confedered in bande before,
 with whom I was confedered before,
 195 whiche by this facte preparedst the waye,
 whiche by this facte preparedst a playne waye,
 200 For looke what measure we other awarde,
 For looke what measure to others we awarde,

Fifteen of the twenty variants in this tragedy convert four-stress lines into fairly normal iambic five-stress lines. Since the variants do not reveal the degeneration of text usually observable in reprints, one can hardly explain them as unintentional. Since they make little difference in the thought of the passages,³ it

² In all the pairs of lines cited, the second is that of the 1578 edition. The first is that of the 1574 edition, which (except in line 38) has the same reading as that of the 1571 edition, which in turn (except in lines 1, 147, and 149) has the same reading as that of the 1559 edition.

³ The addition of *not* reverses the meaning of line 158, thus deteriorating the "reason" of the text; but the change, shown by the context to be

appears probable that the intention was a metrical one. Four of the remaining five variants apparently result from the same intent, but they show a wrenching of the earlier lines to achieve an approximation of iambic pentameter in the 1578 edition

- L 9 To hearken awhyle to Thomas of Wudstocke,
 Turne thine eare to Thomas of Wudstocke,
 38 And most false of fayth where I most affyed
 And most false fayth where I most affyed
 145 To axe a reckening of the Realmes reuenue
 To aske accoumpt of the Realmes reuenue
 189 As execucion doen before iudgement
 As execution to goe before iudgement

These lines are not good iambic pentameters, but they eliminate most of the trisyllabic feet of the earlier versions and in other ways represent changes toward iambic pentameter. They are scarcely less regular, indeed, than many iambic pentameters of other tragedies in the *Mirror* and than many by the less facile among English versifiers of the 1570's generally.

The other variant, the substitution of *assuraunce* for *esperaunce* in line 74, seems to be without metrical significance; and for it I have here no explanation. On the basis of nineteen out of twenty variants we are forced to conclude, therefore, that though neither rhyme nor reason may be improved by these variants, it was most probably someone's intention that the rhythm be "improved" by them. Whether the person or persons responsible for the text of this edition failed to understand the metrics of this tragedy or deliberately avoided the old four-stress line is speculative. The distribution of these variants in the several stanzas⁴ precludes the hypothesis that an effort was made to invent a stanza form combining iambic pentameter with four-stress alliterative verse.

Why someone rewrote these nineteen lines as iambic and allowed one hundred eighty-three other lines to stand I can not explain. To a modern ear, most of those which were not changed are clearly four-stress lines, but a considerable number of them contain ten

obviously incorrect, can hardly have been introduced for its effect upon the thought.

⁴ The iambic lines occupy each of the seven positions within the stanza. Two are first lines; five, second, two, third, five, fourth; three, fifth, one, sixth, two, seventh.

syllables and in another context might pass for iambs⁵ Yet it seems hardly likely that the writer regarded as iambic all of the lines he did not alter. The textual variants in the 1578 version of the tragedy of Thomas of Gloucester constitute a puzzle in metrics. The 1578 edition of the *Mirror* exhibits this peculiarity in no other tragedy of the nineteen tragedies which made up the 1559 *Mirror*. Until further evidence is obtained, the tempting hypothesis that the 1578 version of this tragedy had another authorship than that of the rest of the 1578 *Mirror*, must, however, be rejected.

WILLIAM PEERY

University of North Carolina

THE ELIZABETHAN IDEA OF MELANCHOLY

In recent years, scholars have rediscovered the Elizabethan "science" of psychology, and they have brought its technical and puzzling terms to the interpretation of the great figures of the Shakespearean drama. Hamlet and Jaques, we have been told, provided no problems for the people of the sixteenth century, who knew the exact medical significance of each action and word of the two melancholics.

The proponents of this view draw particularly upon the work of Dr. Timothy Bright, from whom, in their opinion, we may learn the attitude of the average Elizabethan towards melancholy. One scholar, for example, declares:

Thus, in the light of Bright's *Treatise* we get the outlines of a Hamlet of Elizabethan psychology. This Hamlet is not a puppet of dramatic circumstance, pulled now by Kyd's strings and now by Shakespeare's, but a character unified by the qualities of the melancholy man, as Bright presents them.¹

Despite its apparent logic and rightness, however, the theory that Shakespeare based the characters of Hamlet and Jaques upon the pseudopsychology of his own day is open to serious objection.

⁵ E g, *line 2*, And so far from daunger of Fortunes blast; *line 3*, As by the compas of mans coniecture; *line 4*, No brasen pyller maye be fyxt more fast, etc

¹ Mary Isabelle O'Sullivan, "Hamlet and Dr Timothy Bright," *PMLA*, xli (1926), 667-679

Professor E. E. Stoll has protested vigorously against "the disturbing intrusion of antiquarian learning into the interpretation of Shakespeare's characters, the substitution of Elizabethan textbook physiology or psychology for our contemporary sort."² And it is true that there is no evidence that Bright's ideas were shared by the majority of the Elizabethans or even by Shakespeare himself. Such technical textbook terms as "melancholy adust" and others, on which modern scholars lean heavily, are nowhere to be found in the works of Shakespeare. If we are to interpret his characters in the light of Elizabethan psychology, we must first demonstrate that the theatrical audience of his time was thoroughly familiar with the particular type of psychology we choose to apply.

For knowledge of what the Elizabethans, generally, thought about melancholy, we must turn, not to "scientific" writers like Bright, but to such productions as the sermons and treatises of popular preachers. It is in a work by one of the most famous of Puritan divines that we find an exhaustive analysis of melancholy.

Many are of opinion that this sorrowe for sinne is nothing els but a melancholike passion but in trueth the thing is farre otherwise, as may appeare in the example of David who by all coniectures was least troubled with melancholie, and yet never any tasted more deeply of the sorrowe and feeling of Gods anger for sinne than he did, as the booke of Psalmes declareth. And if any desire to know the difference, they are to bee discerned thus Sorrowe for sinne may bee where health, reason, senses, memorie and all are sound but Melancholike passions are where the bodie is unsound, and the reason, senses, memorie, dulled and troubled Secondly, sorrowe for sinne is not cured by any phisicke, but onely by the sprinkling of the blood of Iesus Christ Melancholike passions are removed by phisicke, diet, musicke and such like Thirdly, sorrowe for sinne riseth of the anger of God, that woundeth and pierceth the conscience but Melancholike passions rise onely of meere imaginations strongly conceived in the braine Lastly, these passions are long in breeding, and come by little and little: but the sorrowe for sinne usually commeth on a sudden as lightening into a house. And yet howsoever they are differing, it must bee acknowledged that they may both concurre together so that the same man which is troubled with Melancholie, may feelee also the anger of God for sinne.³

² E E Stoll, "Jaques and the Antiquaries," *MLN*, LIV, (1939), 79-85.

³ William Perkins, *A Treatise Tending / Unto A Declaration, Whether A Man Be In the Estate / of damnation, or in the estate of grace . . .* / . . . , London / Printed by the Widowe Orwin, for / Iohn Porter, 1597, p. 40, sig. C66v.

The "melancholike passion" described by Perkins is close to that described by Bright, but it has been shorn of all subtle distinctions and technical verbiage. It is, probably, as close as we can get to the average Elizabethan's conception of melancholy.

SIDNEY THOMAS

College of the City of New York

CYME, A PURGATIVE DRUG

In attempting to identify some herbs mentioned in Middleton's *Witch*, I discovered that the *O. E. D.* does not define *sum*. According to Gerard, the English term for *sum* is *wild parsley*, and he describes what he calls the "vertues" of this herb with these words:

The root being chewed, bringeth
by the mouth flegme out of the
head, and is a remedy for the
toothache, and there is no doubt
but that it also maketh thin,
cutteth and openeth, provoketh
vrine, and bringeth down the
flowers & doth likewise no less
but more effectually perform
those things which the rest of
the Parsleyes do ¹

Could this *sum* be the *Cyme* which Shakespeare defines as a "purgative drug" in the words of Macbeth (v, iii, 55-6)

What Rubarb, Cyme, or what Purgatiue drugge
Would scowre these English hence

could *cyme* spell *sum*? It must be understood that I am not suggesting an emendation of the text. If the text needs emendation, surely nothing more logical could be suggested than Mr. A. R. Dunlap's reading *Tyme* (that is, *thyme*) instead of *Cyme*.² Mr Dunlap clearly indicates, by the citation of pertinent quotations from Elizabethan and Jacobean herbals, that some of Shakespeare's

¹ John Gerard, *The Herball or Generall Historie of Plantes* (London, 1597), p. 867.

² A. R. Dunlap, "What Purgative Drug?," *MLN*, LIV (1939), 92-4

contemporaries considered thyme to be a purgative. He likewise comments on the undoubted fact that *c* or *C* is easily mistaken for *t* or *T* in Elizabethan handwriting. The only objections that could be made to this emendation are (1) although some of Shakespeare's contemporaries considered thyme to be a purgative, he himself never spoke of it as such, in fact, it seems almost impossible to use a word which has a connotation of catharsis in such a passage as

I know a banke where the wilde time blowes,
Where Oxslips and the nodding Violet growes,
Quite oucr-cannoped with luscious woodbine,
With sweet muske roses, and with Eglantine,³

and (2) although *t* and *c* are easily mistaken in Elizabethan handwriting, they are no more easily mistaken than many other possible combinations of letters. These objections, are of course, nothing more than quibbles, and if an emendation is required, Mr. Dunlap's suggestion is quite the best so far.

What this paper would like to propose tentatively is that the line in question (*Macbeth*, V, iii, 55) was printed correctly in the First Folio. After all, the most erudite emendation rests on much less secure foundations of *possible* existence than the *actually* existing text. Or, if a unique word is too much to expect from Shakespeare in this context, it seems not impossible that the compositor here—as he seems to have done many times elsewhere⁴—heard the word he saw written in the author's manuscript and (with a memory of the sound, rather than the sight of what the author wrote) set the type as we now find it.

FRANK SULLIVAN

St. Louis University

SOME UNPUBLISHED VERSES BY THOMAS RANDOLPH

Many of Thomas Randolph's poems omitted from the incomplete posthumous editions of 1638 and 1640 may have been lost beyond recovery with the disappearance of the manuscript volume

³ *MND.*, II, i, 249-52.

⁴ Cf. William Blades, "Common Typographical Errors with Special Reference to the Text of Shakespeare," *Athenaeum*, 1872, I, 114

circumstantially described by William Oldys in the annotated *Langbaine*.

Old Counsellor Fane of Colchester, who in *Forma Pauperis* deceived me of a good sum of money which he owed me, and not long after set up his chariot, gave me a parcel of MSS and promised me among others (which he never gave me, nor anything else, besides a barrel of oysters) a MS copy of Randolph's poems, an original, as he said, with many additions never printed, being devolved to him as the author's relation ¹

Lacking such an "original," Randolph's modern editors have found the establishment of a complete and accurate canon a difficult task. A few of the previously omitted poems, preserved in the manuscript anthologies of Randolph's period, have been identified and published in the editions of W. C. Hazlitt (London, 1875) and John Jay Parry (New Haven, 1917), and the Randolph canon has been further enlarged by the researches of the late Professor G. C. Moore Smith,² most of whose discoveries were incorporated in the edition of G. Thorn-Drury (London, 1929). To this body of material I am able to add, from a contemporary manuscript, three small pieces whose authenticity is vouched for not only by the compiler's ascription—which in itself might not be conclusive—but also by their close relation to Randolph's unquestioned work.

The manuscript, *HM172* in the Henry E Huntington Library, is a quarto volume now containing thirty-two leaves (a number have been lost) in an unidentified secretary hand of the first half of the seventeenth century.³ It contains forty-nine poems, with or without attribution, by Cominius, Dr. Alablaster, Thomas Freeman, Francis Bacon, Dr. Henry King, Thomas Randolph, Thomas Carew, Robert Thompson, Gervaise Wermestrie, James Shirley, Dr. Richard Corbet, Ben Jonson, and others, those which may be taken as Randolph's are as follows:

¹ Transcribed by G. Thorn-Drury, in *Poems of Thomas Randolph* (London, 1929), p. xxi

² See his articles in *Palaestra*, CXLVIII (1925), 244-257, and *RES*, I (1925), 319-320, and his Warton Lecture in English Poetry, *Thomas Randolph* (British Academy, London, 1927)

³ De Ricci and Wilson, in their *Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada*, I, 61, give the provenance as follows: Sold by Thorpe (Cat., 1836, n 1035) to Sir T. Philpotts (n 10110), his sale (London, 1895, n 903) to Quaritch, Robert Hoe sale (New York, 1911, I, n 2177) to G. D. Smith. Items from this manuscript are reproduced by permission of the Huntington Library.

I. (fols. 5^v-6^v) *On a very deformed Gentlewoman, but of a voice incomparably sweete* ("I chanc'd sweete Lesbia's voyce to heare"), unsigned.

II. (fol. 6^v) *In eandem Dysticon*, and same *Englshed* (both printed below), signed Tho: Randolph.

III. (fols. 10^v-14^r) *His complaynt on Cupid that hee never yet made him enamored* ("How many of thy Captives, Love Complayne"), signed Tho Randolph.

IV. (fol. 14^r) *The song of Discord* ("Lett Linus and Amphions lute"), signed Tho: Randolph.

V. (fol. 14^{r-v}) *The Masque of vices* ("Say in a dance, how shall wee goe"), signed Tho: Randolphe.

VI. (fol 14^v) *In Archimedis Sphæram. ex Claudiano* ("Jove, sawe the Heavens form'd in a little glasse"), signed Tho: Randolph.

VII. (fols. 14^v-15^r) "When Jove sawe Archimedes world of glasse" (printed below), signed Tho: Randolphe.

VIII. (fols. 22^r-24^v) *Of an inæstimable content hee enjoyes in the Muses, to those of his freundes, that dehort him from Poetry* ("Goe sordid earth, and hope not to bewitch"), signed Tho: Randolph

IX. (fol. 24^v) *De moderatione Animi in vtrâq; fortunâ* (printed below), signed Tho: Randolph.

Of these pieces, nos. I, III, IV, VI, and VIII were included in Randolph's posthumous *Poems* of 1638, and no. V appears, as a "Song and Dance," in his *Muses Looking-glasse* of the same year. The only significant variants in the manuscript version of these authenticated poems occur in no. I; here the extra couplet

Then would I wedd with Giges ring
And turne all eare, to heare the sing,

is interpolated after line 68, and the four concluding lines appear as

But love or hate must in mee rise,
While shee hath voice or I have eyes
If not, you Godes to ease my mynde,
Or make her dumbe, or strike mee blinde

Thorn-Drury⁴ mentions similar variants in the text of this poem

⁴ Thorn-Drury, *op. cit.*, p. 183.

from other transcripts, of which he knew "more than a dozen" He also prints a Latin distich, different from no. II in the present manuscript, as sometimes accompanying it.

No. II, the first of the new verses, is itself a mere pendant to the lines on the "Deformed Gentlewoman," which it immediately follows.

In eandem Dysticon

Vox Helenam, vultus Hecubam te Lesbia clamat

Vox (mihi namqz places) Incipe, forma tace

Englised

By thy lookes Hecuba, Helen by thy song,
Lett thy voyce speake, bidd thy face hold her tongue

Tho Randolph

No. VII also stands in close relation to one of Randolph's established works, the translation of Claudian's "Iuppiter in parvo cum cerneret aethera vitro"—a translation which it succeeds in the present manuscript, and from which it derives its theme

When Jove sawe Archimedes world of glasse,
Wherein each orbe, each Spheare, each motion was,
His wisdom hee condemnes, that would impart
To such a brittle mettle so much Art
Jove doe not that in Archimedis blame,
Which fault in thy creation is the same,
The matter of thy greater world all see,
Like his is nothing but fragilitie

Tho Randolphe

Finally, the six lines of prudential advice constituting no. IX may logically be associated with Randolph's thirty-seven rhymed "Precepts"—religious, moral, and practical—published in the *Poems* of 1638 under the general title "Necessary observations"

De moderatione Animi in vtrâqz fortunâ

Is thy poore Barke becalm'd? and forc'd to stay
A prisoner fetter'd vpp in a dead Sea?
Spight of the threatens, that desperation brings,
Bidd her at large spredd forth her canvas winges,
In expectation of a happier gale,
But when thy winde blowes faire, contract her saile

Tho Randolph

This well-worn morality finds more eloquent expression in a long

speech assigned to "golden" Mediocrity in *The Muses Looking-glasse*.⁵

None of these verses will add much to Randolph's stature as a poet. Neither the Latin distich nor its English rendering—though Randolph's contemporaries may have found there some crumb of "wit"—is likely to delight the modern reader, and the *De moderatione Animi* sounds like very youthful rhyming. A little more may, perhaps, be claimed for no. VII, its conceit is skilfully shaped, and the theme of the world's fragility is nowadays a pregnant one.

RHODES DUNLAP

State University of Iowa

THOMAS CAREW, THOMAS CAREY, AND "THE SOVEREIGN OF THE SEAS"

In the volume of *Minor Poets of the 17th Century* which he edited for Everyman's Library in 1931, Mr. R. G. Howarth printed (p. 166) for the first time among the poems of Thomas Carew a sixteen-line poem "Upon the Royal Ship called the 'Sovereign of the Seas' built by Peter Pett, Master Builder; his Father, Captain Phineas Pett, Supervisor: 1637," from Additional MS. 34,217, fol. 29, in the British Museum. This manuscript contains Latin and English versions of the poem, the Latin signed "Hen · Jacob" and the English "Tho: Carew."¹ Another copy, with similar ascriptions to Jacob and Carew, is listed in the *Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission*, x, 4, p. 21, as among MSS. of the Earl of Westmoreland, and a third copy appears in the upper corners of John Payne's engraving, issued in 1637 or 1638, "The true portraictvire of his Ma.^{ties} royall ship The Sovereigne of the Seas."² In Payne's text the Latin verses, which begin

⁵ Ed 1638, pp 86-89.

¹ The signatures are in different hands from that of the copyist. Comparison of the "Tho Carew" with Thomas Carew's authenticated signatures in the Oxford University Subscription Register (1608) and in three letters (1616) at the Public Record Office (S. P. 14/88 67, 77, and 87) is inconclusive, since the differences which appear could conceivably have developed in Carew's hand during the long interval from 1616 to 1637.

² For a contemporary account of the vessel which evoked the verses and

"*Scilicet Octauo stupeant Miracula nostro*," are subscribed "Henr. Iacob"; the English verses appear as follows:

Triton's auspicious Sound usher Thy raigne
O re the curl'd billowes, Royal SOVERAINE,
Monarchal Ship, whose Fabrick doth outpride
The Pharos, Colosse, Memphique Pyramide
And seemes a moouing Towre, when sprightly gales
Quicken the motion, and embreath the sailes.
Wee y^t haue heard of SEAVEN, now see ye EIGHT
Wonder at home, of Nauall art the height
This Britain ARGO putts down that of Greece
Be-Deck't with more then one rich Golden Fleece
Wrought into Sculptures, which Emblemazize
Pregnant Concept to the more Curious eyes
Neptune is proud o'th burden, and doth wonder
To heare a Fourefold Fire out-rore Ioue's Thunder
Onn then Triumphal Arke, with EDGAR's fame,
To CHARLES his Scepter add y^e Trident's claime.
Tho Cary

The author of the Latin verses is identifiable as "Henry Jacob . . . the prodigie of his age for Philological and Oriental learning," who, according to Wood, "spent some time with the famous *Selden*, an. 1636 in composing a book. . . . At which time, as 'tis said, he taught, or at least improved, *Selden* in the Hebrew Language."³ Jacob was, after 1629, a fellow of Merton College, Oxford, where Thomas Carew had at an earlier time (1608-1611) been a student, he translated into Latin verse Carew's poem "Ingratefull beauty threatned";⁴ and the two men may well have known each other. But it is not necessary to assume that the

engraving see Thomas Heywood's *A true Description of his Majesties royall and most stately Ship called the Sovereign of the Seas, built at Wolwetch in Kent 1637*, published 1637, this contains a poem on the ship by Shackerley Marmion, besides an "Epigrammaticall iapture" of Heywood's own. Sir Richard Fanshawe also has Latin and English verses on the subject, printed with his translation of *Il Pastor Fido*, 1647, and "A salutation of his Majesties Ship the Sovereign" appears in Henry King's *Poems, Elegies, Paradoxes, and Sonnets*, 1657. Payne's engraving is noticed in the second issue of Heywood's volume (1638).

³ Anthony à Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses* (1691), II, 89. See also Brodrick, *Memorials of Merton College* (Oxford Historical Society, 1885), pp. 285-6.

⁴ *Philologiae 'Avakalvtrῆπιον Oratione celebratum Inaugurali, Quam publice habuit ad Oxonio-Mertonenses Henricus Iacobus* (1652), p. 47.

Thomas Carew or Cary who wrote the English verses on "The Sovereign of the Seas" was Thomas Carew, author of "A Rapture." The names Carew, Carey, and Cary are practically interchangeable in seventeenth-century usage, and there were at least two other "poetical" Thomas Careys writing at the same time as Thomas Carew. The better-known Thomas Carey, born in 1597, second son of the Earl of Monmouth and Gentleman of the Bedchamber to Charles I, was the author of verses incorrectly attributed to Thomas Carew by W. C. Hazlitt (1870) and J. W. Ebsworth (1893),⁵ he died, however, in 1634, too early to have been the author of the present poem. The other Thomas Cary was the translator of Puget de la Serre's *The Mirrour which Flatters Not*, 1639. He was born at Tower Hill, the son of Allen Cary, gentleman, had his schooling at Tower Hill, and on March 13, 1622/23, at the age of seventeen, was admitted as Fellow-Commoner at Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge. He graduated B. A. in 1625/26, was admitted to Gray's Inn on Jan. 29, 1626/27, and on Dec. 21, 1629 was appointed Gentleman Porter of the Tower.⁶ James Howell addressed to him one of the letters (a New Year's missive) in the *Epistolae Ho-Elanae*.⁷ Thomas Cary of Tower Hill was a dogged but uninspired poet. His mannerisms and degree of competence as a versifier may be indicated by an excerpt from the valedictory couplets which he published with his translated *Mirrour*:

So, now 'tis done, although it be no Taske,
That did much Braines, or toylesome Study aske
The meaning I 'vouch good, but Merit small,
In rendring English, the FRENCH PRINCIPALL.
It is but a Translation I confesse,
And yet the Rubs of Death in't nerthlesse
May trippe some cap'ring Fancies of the Time,
That Domincere, and Swagger it in Rime,
That Charge upon the Reader, and gae Fire.⁸

⁵ These confusions were set straight by Arthur Vincent in his edition of *The Poems of Thomas Carew* (Muses' Library), pp. xxvii-xxx1.

⁶ John and J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, I, 1, 272; Rymer, *Foedera*, xix, 133.

⁷ James Howell, *Epistolae Ho-Elanae* (ed. Jacobs, 1890), pp. 627-8: "To Mr. T. C., at his House upon Tower-hill."

⁸ *The Mirrour which Flatters Not* (1639), sig. Q8.

There are forty-eight lines of this, matching those on "The Sovereign of the Seas" in their labored style and poetic mediocrity. Thomas Carew wrote nothing at all similar. And external evidence corroborates this judgment, for whereas the acquaintance (and thus the possible collaboration) of Thomas Carew with Henry Jacob is entirely hypothetical, Thomas Cary's *The Mirrour which Flatters Not* contains a set of complimentary verses in English, Latin, and Greek, headed "To my endeared Friend, the Translator, Mr Thomas Cary" and signed by Henry Jacob.

RHODES DUNLAP

State University of Iowa

BURTON, BACON, AND SANDYS

A study of the successive editions of Burton's great work, *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, constitutes one of the most fascinating problems of seventeenth-century scholarship. It is possible to observe in the various changes the growth of Burton's mind, his aliveness to new information, and his constant perusal of sources, ancient and modern. Like so many of his contemporaries, he seems to have been especially aware of the current news about foreign lands supplied by the numerous travel books of his period.

At some time between the third edition (1628) and the fourth (1632), Burton¹ decided to insert into a section on "Alteratives and Cordials" an interesting passage on a new restorative drink

The Turkes have a drinke called *Coffa* (for they use no wine) so named of a berry as blacke as soot, and as bitter, (like that blacke drinke which was in use amongst the *Lacedemonians* and perhaps the same) which they sip still of, and sup as warme as they can suffer, they spend much time in those *Coffa*-houses, which are somewhat like our Alehouses and Tavernes, and there they sit chatting and drinking to drive away the time, and to bee merry together, because they finde by experience that kinde of drinke so used helpeth digestion, and procureth alacrity. Some of them take opium to this purpose

This, as it happens, was the passage that troubled Paul Jordan-Smith² because he had to concede that even Ignatius Donnelly had

¹ *Anat. of Mel.*, fol. Ccc4.

² Paul Jordan-Smith, *Bibliographia Burtoniana: A Study of Robert Burton's The Anatomy of Melancholy* (Palo Alto, 1931), pp. 76-77

here a seemingly tenable argument, Donnelly had exultantly pointed to a remarkably similar passage in Bacon's *Natural History*.³

They have in Turkey a drink called *coffa*, made of a berry of the same name, as black as soot, and of a strong scent, but not aromatical, which they take, beaten into powder, in water, as hot as they can drink it and they take it, and sit at it in their coffa-houses, which are like our taverns. This drink comforteth the brain and heart, and helpeth digestion. Certainly this berry coffa, the root and leaf betel, the leaf tobacco, and the tear of poppy (opium), of which the Turks are great takers (supposing it expelleth all fear), do all condense the spirits, and make them strong and aliger.

Donnelly's *The Great Cryptogram*⁴ concludes: "We find both writers treating of the same subject, in the same language, with the same ideas, and even falling into the same error, that is, to say that the coffee berry is 'as black as soot'" The conclusion, then, is inescapable—the two passages were written by the same hand.

Some years before either Burton or Bacon wrote, George Sandys published his *Relation of a Journey begun An Dom. 1610*.⁵ In it occurs the following:

Wine is prohibited them by their *Alcoran*. Although they be destitute of Taverns, yet have they their Coffa-houses, which something resemble them. There sit they chatting most of the day, and sippe of a drinke called Coffa (of the berry that it is made of) in little *China* dishes, as hot as they can suffer it. blacke as soote, and tasting not much unlike it (why not that blacke broth which was in use amongst the *Lacedemonians*?) which helpeth, as they say, digestion, and procureth alacrity many of the coffa-men keeping beautifull boyes, who serve as stales to procure them customers. The *Turkes* are also incredible takers of *Opium* . . which they say expelleth all feare, and makes them couragious

Clearly this is the parent of both passages. In it are many details common to it and one of the two authors but lacking in the other. Bacon seemingly did not consider that the Lacedemonians were an essential addition to his scientific data. He saw no reason to represent the Turks as "chatting" over their coffee. Burton, on the other hand, implies that opium is taken to help digestion and procure alacrity; Bacon brings over the detail from Sandys more

³ *Works* (Boston, 1860-1862), v, 26-27.

⁴ (Chicago, 1888), pp. 966-967.

⁵ (London, 1621), p. 66.

accurately when he says that opium "expelleth all fear." Other interesting differences may easily be detected by the reader.

It is always fascinating to speculate why certain changes should have been made. The minister in Burton excluded the passage about "beautifull boyes", Bacon saw that it would not contribute to his scientific purpose. Bacon introduces details from other sources "aromatical," "beaten into powder," betel and tobacco, "strong and aleger." Burton, on the other hand, follows Sandys with remarkable closeness. The latter's "There sit they chatting" becomes "there they sit chatting." And it almost looks as though he were trying to disarm the reader in the casual way in which he parenthesizes "like that blacke drinke which was in use amongst the *Lacedemonians* and perhaps the same." Sandys, to be sure, had been slightly more conservative in his statement, but he too had used the parenthesis. One wonders how many passages there are, all told, in Burton where quotation marks have been omitted.⁶

ROBERT R. CAWLEY

Princeton University

A BORROWING FROM SPENSER BY PHINEAS FLETCHER

The indebtedness of Phineas Fletcher's *Piscatorie Eclogues* to Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender* is widely recognized. A number of similarities between the poems have been pointed out,¹ but an interesting borrowing, constituting a rather distinct type, has been overlooked.

The opening line of the third piscatory eclogue,

A Fisher-lad (no higher dares he look),

is certainly echoed from the beginning of Spenser's "January,"

A shepeheards boye (no better doe him call),

and the whole opening section of Fletcher's poem is a translation into piscatory terms of the first lines of "January." Fletcher's fifth stanza reads

⁶ Shilleto, in his excellent edition of *The Anatomy*, failed to note that the Burton passage was derived from Sandys.

¹ A. B. Langdale (*Phineas Fletcher, Man of Letters, Science, and Divinity*, New York, 1937, Appendix B, pp. 217-218) presents an extensive list of Fletcher's borrowings from Spenser and others in the *Piscatorie Eclogues*.

You sea-born maids, that in the ocean reigne,
 (If in your courts is known Loves matchlesse power,
 Kindling his fire in you cold watry bower)
 Learn by your own to pity others pain
Tryphon, that know'st a thousand herbs in vain,
 But know'st not one to cure a love-sick heart,
 See here a wound, that farre outgoes thy art

The seventh and eighth stanzas each develop the idea suggested in their opening lines.

How well, fair *Thetis*, in thy glasse I see
 As in a crystal, all my raging pains'
 Such cruel storms my restles heart command
 Late thousand joyes securely lodged there.

This is exactly the same sequence of ideas and corresponding imagery which opens Spenser's "January" In the third stanza Spenser writes.

'Ye gods of love, that pitie lovers payne,
 (If any gods the paine of lovers pitie)
 Looke from above, where you in joyes remaine,
 And bowe your eares unto my dolefull dittie
 And Pan, thou shepheards god, that once didst love,
 Pitie the paines that thou thy selfe didst prove

The fourth and fifth stanzas begin:

'Thou barrein ground, whome winters wrath hath wasted,
 Art made a myrrhour to behold my plight
 'Such rage as winters reigneth in my heart,
 My lofe bloud friesing with unkindly cold

In these passages very similar lines of address are followed by conditional parentheses and by respective appeals to Tryphon, a god of the sea, and to Pan, a god of forests and shepherds. Fletcher finds in the sea (the glass of Thetis) the mirror for sorrows which Spenser had seen in the barren winter land, and both recognize the external scene as symbolic of the unrest within. Here Fletcher appears to be consciously adapting the pastoral verse of Spenser to the seaside locale of his own poem.

BAIN TATE STEWART

University of Tennessee

THE BURNING OF MILTON'S *DEFENSIO* IN FRANCE

The inhospitable reception of Milton's *Defensio* in France has long been familiar to students,¹ but the facts have come to us hitherto chiefly from Milton's own references in his *Defensio Secunda*² and from contemporary newspapers.³ It is now possible to supplement these sources by a detailed account taken directly from the official French records.⁴ The following extracts tell the full story of the indignation experienced in monarchical France towards the impertinence of the democratically minded upstart pamphleteer who dared to recommend and condone the execution of a king.

In brief summary these documents indicate: (1) that the *Defensio* reached Toulouse for distribution shortly before June 16, 1651, (2) that the royal counsellors, MM. de Tournell and de Fresals, having examined the book, gave orders that it should be publicly burned in the Place du Salin; (3) that they also enjoined all booksellers and printers from touching the book, on grave penalties, and commanded them to return all copies already on hand within a week, (4) that this sentence was pronounced in the Parliament at Toulouse on June 16, 1651; (5) that information about the *Defensio* reached Paris some days previous to July 6, 1651; (6) that the royal government, having taken cognizance of its abhorrent character, ordered it publicly torn to pieces and burned in the Place de Grève; (7) that Parisian booksellers and printers, as in Toulouse, were forbidden to handle it; (8) that private citizens were prohibited from owning or possessing it; (9) that it was publicly burned in the Place de Grève on July 6, 1651; (10) that this order was publicly announced throughout the city and the University of Paris, with full paraphernalia of hue and cry, on July 11, 1651; (11) that these acts, despite Milton's protest to the contrary,⁵ appear strictly official.

¹ David Masson, *The Life of John Milton*, iv (1877), 341

² Milton, *Defensio Secunda*, *Columbia Works*, viii, 186-191.

³ *Mercurius Politicus*, # 56 (June 26-July 3, 1651), p. 899; *ibid.*, # 58 (July 10-17), last page

⁴ Bibliothèque Nationale, MS F. L. 602, ff 21-23. See also A. Vidier and P. Perrier, *Bibliothèque Nationale, Catalogue Général des Manuscrits Français*, iv (Paris, 1937), 379

⁵ Milton, *Defensio Secunda*, *Works*, viii, 186-187.

The first extract is the order at Toulouse:

Extrait des Registres de Parlem^t.

Sur la requeste verbalement faite par le Procureur Gräl⁷ du Roy, contenant que depuis quelques iours il se debite vn liure en la presente ville intitulé *Joannis Miltoni Angli pro populo Anglicano defensio contra Salmasij defensionem Regiam*, imprimé a Londres la presente annee, contenant des Maximes impies et seditieuses, tendant a la destruction, rabaiss^{ment} et aneantissem^{ent} entier des monarchies estables de Dieu en terre pour la conduite des hommes Et dautant que ce liure est iniurieux a l'autorité Royale, que l'auteur du liure tasche de rendre contemptible & mesprisable aux peuples, et quil seroit d'une tres pernicieuse consequence de souffrir la debite et lecture du dit liure dans vn Royaume comme la France, gouvernee successiuellement puis tans de siecles par les Rois qu'il a pleu a Dieu lui donner, A requis qu'il pleut a la Cour y pourvoir par la prudence ordinaire, Et veu le dit liure, et ouïs⁸ Maistres de Tourrel & de Fresals Cons⁹ du Roy en la Cour & Commissaires à ce pai [Nous⁹] ¹⁰ deputez, La Cour, ayant esgard a la diste requeste, A ordonné & ordonne que le dit liure Intitulé *Ioannis Miltoni Angli pro Populo Anglicano defensio*, imprimé a Londres la presente Annee, sera brusle a la place du Salin par l'executeur de la haute iustice, au quel effet auroit enioint aux officiers de la Seneschaussee, Viguer et Capitouls ¹¹ d'assister a l'exécution du present Arrest, en la forme accoustumée A fait & fait inhibitions et defenses a tous marchans libraires, imprimeurs & autres personnes de quelque qualité qu'elles soient, de vendre, debiter ni tenir chez eux le dit liure, a peine de quatre mil liures d'amende & autre arbitre Leur enoignant sur mesme peine de remettre dans huitaine apres la publication du present Arrest tous les exemplaires qu'ils en peuvent auoir deuers le Greffe ¹² de la Cour Prononcé a Tolose en Parlem^t le dix-septiesme Junn 1651. Signé De Malenfant.

The second order comes from Paris, about three weeks after the preceding ¹³

1651 De par le Roy, ou Mons^r le Preuost de Paris,
ou son Lieutenant ciuil.

Sur ce qui nous a esté remonstré par le Procureur du Roy, que depuis peu

⁶ *Op. cit.*, ff 21-22

⁷ *I. e.*, "général."

⁸ An absolute construction "the book having been seen and [the commissioners] having been heard."

⁹ *I. e.*, "conseillers."

¹⁰ Since this word comes at the edge of the page and hence is not clear in the photostat, this reading is tentative

¹¹ Technical titles of certain officers of justice.

¹² The registry.

¹³ *Op. cit.*, f. 23.

de iours on a publié un Liure intitulé, *Joannis Miltoni Angli pro populo Anglicano defensio contra Claudij [Salmasij erased] anonymi, aliàs Salmasij defensionem regiam* lequel est rempli de diuerses propositions contraires a la doctrine de l'Eglise, a l'obeissance deue aux souuerains, qui ne peuuent y auoir esté mises qu'a dessein d'exciter les peuples a sedition. A quoi il requiert estre pouueu Nous oui la dite Remonstrance, & apres que le liure a esté leu & examiné a la chambre du Conseil, Ordonnons par deliberation d'icelui,¹⁴ que le dit Liure intitulé. *Ioannis Miltoni Angli pro populo*, &c comme contenant vne doctrine impie, contraire aux loix diuines et humaines, seditieuse, tendante a la destruction des estats, à attenter à la personne des Roys & Princes souuerains, & a détourner les subiets de leur obeissance, sera laceré & bruslé par les mains de l'executeur de haute Justice en place de Greue Et qu'a la requeste du Procureur du Roy il sera informé contre les Autheurs & Imprimeurs du dit liure, & procedé contre eux extraordinairement suuant la rigueur des Ordonances Faisons defenses a toutes personnes de le uendre, debiter, & faire courir dans le public, mesmes de le retenir dans leurs maisons, à peine d'estre reputez fauteurs de telles propositions, & d'estre procedé contre eux comme criminels de leze Maesté diuine & humaine Et seront ces presentes leues & publiées à son de trompe & cry public, & affichées aux carrefours de cette ville de Paris Ce fut fait & donné par Messire Dreux Daubray Seigneur d'Offemont, Villiers & autres lieux, Conseiller du Roy en ses conseils, & Lieutenant Ciuil en la preuosté & Vicomté de Paris, le sixième Juillet 1651. Prononcé & executé, et le dit liure bruslé en la dite place de Greue le dit iour. Signé, Coudray.

The third, dated five days later, follows directly on the second:¹⁵

Le Mardi 11 Juillet 1651 la Sentence cy-dessus a esté leue & publiée a son de trompe & cry public, par les carrefours ordinaires de cette Ville, & dans l'Vniuersité de Paris par moy Charles Canto Juré crieur ordinaire du Roy en la dite Ville preuosté et Vicomté de Paris, accompagné de Jean du Bos, Jacques le Frain Iurez Trompettes du Roy es¹⁶ dits lieux, & d'un autre trompette commis

Signé Canto.

J. MILTON FRENCH

Rutgers University

¹⁴ *I e.*, "the same"

¹⁵ *Op cit*, f. 23

¹⁶ *I e.*, "en les."

MILTON'S CALLIMACHUS

Professor Harris Fletcher has recently identified certain editions of Homer to which John Milton had access, and which he studied before 1630.¹ The evidence used is both simple and conclusive, consisting of an analysis of the *marginalia* in Milton's own handwriting in the 1620 edition of Pindar in the Harvard University Library. The citations of Homer and Eustathius in the *marginalia* give page references, and as a result Professor Fletcher was able to prove his conclusions beyond all doubt. Unfortunately Milton did not use page references to all the editions of classical authors he cited, so that exact identifications of the other books in his private library are rendered more difficult, and in some cases impossible.

For Callimachus, however, the problem is perhaps even simpler than for Homer. In the *marginalia* of the Pindar, Milton quotes from or refers to the hymns, epigrams, and fragments of Callimachus twenty-seven times.² Most of these passages are simply pertinent verse references or quotations from Callimachus, but five times Milton adds, as further evidence, references to the annotations of Bonaventura Vulcanius on Callimachus, either in support of the quoted line, or for an interpretation of the Pindaric text and commentary. In none of the passages is the page number added, but that is not necessary in order to establish the identity of the young Milton's edition of Callimachus. There seems to have been only one edition of Callimachus by Vulcanius, that, namely, which appeared in 1584 at Antwerp,³ and which contained a text, a Latin translation, and a commentary. Bound with it, separately edited also by Vulcanius, are the *Idylls* of Moschus and Bion. Milton quotes from Moschus only four times in the Pindar *marginalia*, and does not mention Bion at all. The four quotations, however, may reasonably be regarded as deriving from this same edition, because Milton had a way of being thorough in his use of a book, and we have no evidence that he used any other edition of Moschus.

One of Milton's annotations is also of interest; it throws light on

¹ H. Fletcher, "Milton's Homer," *JEGP*, xxxviii (1939), 229-32

² Unhappily not all of them are in the Columbia edition's 'transcripts' of the *marginalia*, because the editors of that work restricted themselves to a selection which included only notes that display originality by Milton

³ A copy of this edition has been available for examination at the Library of the University of Illinois.

his methods of study. On page 230 of the Pindar, he proposes a change in the text. The passage is *Olympian Odes* 13, 81, in which the editor accepts the manuscript reading ἀνέρύη, whereas in the margin Milton has written αὐερύην. This latter reading is not mentioned in the commentary, and in quoting from the *Iliad* the editor uses the form ἀνέρυσαν. This is the only substantial textual change in Pindar which Milton made without selecting a reading from the commentary. Consequently Milton offers his own reasons for the change in the following marginal note on page 231:

Vide Bonaventura Vule in Callim. hymn, in Diana, versus 91, qui legit αὐερύειν vel αὐ ἐρύειν non ἀνέρύειν

Bon Vul legit hic Αὐ ἐρυσαν μὲν πρῶτα, καὶ ἐσφαξαν καὶ ἔδειραν *Iliad* α.

Examination of Vulcanius' commentary⁴ shows that Milton is appealing to a scholarly three-page note in support of the proposed change. The line from the *Iliad*⁵ is used by Vulcanius as noted by Milton, and in addition the editor of Callimachus quotes the Pindar passage as well, with the form αὐερύη.⁶ Milton then is not actually making an emendation, but is rather drawing on the resources of his memory and wide studies. In other words, here is a concrete example of the student Milton at work. In the present instance his chief tool is our edition of Callimachus. Just as for Homer Milton had access to what Dr. Fletcher calls the "most elaborate and comprehensive scholarly works" of his age, so for Callimachus he found available an edition of considerable scholarly worth, the identification of which may prove to have something more than mere bibliographical interest.

NATHAN DANE II

University of Illinois

⁴ Pp 204-6.

⁵ A 459 It is interesting to note that Vulcanius quotes the same line from Homer in col 798 of his *Thesaurus Utriusque Linguae*, published at Leyden in 1600, a copy of which is also available at the Library of the University of Illinois

⁶ This passage in Pindar has caused the editors considerable trouble for reasons of metre and dialect. In general, however, most recent editors, except Farnell, have accepted ἀνέρύη. This is apparently what Milton intended by αὐερύην, since he is quoting Vulcanius, who reads ἀνέρύη, which is attested by one scholiast, but not by the manuscripts

A NOTE ON BLAIR'S EDITION OF *THE UNHAPPY FAVOURITE*

In the Introduction to his facsimile reprint of Banks's *The Unhappy Favourite* (1682 Quarto), Mr. T. M. H. Blair discusses the source of the play.¹ He accepts Langbaine's statement that the play was "founded on a novel called, *The Secret History of the Most Renowned Queen Elizabeth and the Earl of Essex*, printed in 12°. Lond. 1680."² In the last scene of Part I of this intimate novel, of which there are two parts, Rutland, not knowing that the Queen plans to pardon Essex, visits Elizabeth to plead for the life of the man who is secretly married to Rutland and who has been imprisoned for treason against the Queen. Mr. Blair describes Rutland's explanation of Essex's actions as follows:

Their private marriage, she confesses, "contrary to the Respect due to your Majesty," led him to fear the Queen's just indignation and gave him the idea of seeking "*Revenge*" [sic] outside her dominions, but he never harbored a thought of conspiring against her rule.³

The passage in the *Secret History* thus described reads:

I acknowledge, Madam, that after a thousand Crosses, we had that tender Kindness one for the other, that we married privately, contrary to the Respect due to your Majesty. This, Madam this only, and his Fear of your Majesty's just Indignation, put the Earl of Essex upon seeking *Revenge* out of your Dominions, He thought it fit I should go out of them, but never harboured a Thought of conspiring against your Majesty.⁴

Mr. Blair is quite naturally troubled by the lack of artistic and psychological nicety in the choice of the word "Revenge," and offers the following justification for its use:

Rutland is not careful in her choice of the most tactful word in the circumstances; presumably she means a purely personal kind of *revenge* which takes the form of living his private life as he desires to live it,

¹ T. M. H. Blair, ed., *The Unhappy Favourite or the Earl of Essex*, by John Banks (New York, 1939), pp. 36-49.

² Gerard Langbaine, *An Account of the English Dramatic Poets*, etc. (Oxford, 1691), p. 9.

³ Blair, *op cit.*, p. 42. The italics throughout this paper are mine.

⁴ P. 50, lines 12-23. There is a copy of this book in the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D. C.

regardless of the Queen's probable indignation. She does not mean political *revenge* taking the form of treason.⁵

Considering that Essex had pretended a great affection for Elizabeth while secretly married to Rutland, that he had plotted with Tyrone while in command of the English forces in Ireland, and that he was at this time wholly in Elizabeth's power, there can be no doubt that Rutland's use of the word "Revenge" requires explanation. There is, however, a more adequate explanation than that offered by Mr. Blair.

A chapbook in the Harvard Library bears the following title page:

The / History / of the Most Renowned / Queen Elizabeth, / and Her Great Favourite, / The Earl of Essex / In Two Parts / A Romance / [A woodcut of Essex / A woodcut of Elizabeth] / London Printed by W O and Sold by the Booksellers⁶

Long ago John Ashton saw that this chapbook was based upon the *Secret History*.⁷ In fact, the chapbook is composed almost wholly of excerpts of those passages in the *Secret History* necessary to the narrative. There are, consequently, many passages in the chapbook which are similar word for word to passages in the *Secret History*. The passage in the chapbook corresponding to the passage from the *Secret History* quoted earlier reads.

I own, Madam, that after a thousand Crosses, we had that tender Kindness for each other, that we married privately, contrary to that Respect due from us to your Majesty. This, Madam, and this only, with his fear of your just indignation, put the Earl of Essex upon seeking *Refuge* out of your Domions [*sic*]. He thought it fit I should go out of them, but never entertain'd a thought of Conspiring against your Majesty.⁸

We immediately observe that "Refuge" has taken the place of

⁵ *Op cit.*, p. 42, n 5

⁶ See W C Lane, ed., *Catalogue of English Chap-books and Broadside Ballads in Harvard College Library* (Library of Harvard University Bibliographical Publications, no 56, Cambridge, 1905), no 224. See also nos. 225 and 226.

⁷ John Ashton, *Chapbooks of the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1882), p 396.

⁸ P. 18, lines 32-37. This quotation occurs at the beginning of Part II, instead of at the end of Part I, as in the Folger *Secret History*. Perhaps the edition from which this chapbook was made differed from the edition now to be found in the Folger Library in this respect.

"Revenge," and that Rutland's statement offers no difficulty when this substitution is made.

The word "Revenge" in the passage from the copy of the *Secret History* which Mr. Blair examined seems best explained as a misprint for "Refuge." That there were other editions of this very popular book is evidenced by the *Term Catalogues*, I (1668-1709).⁹ Also, Sir Sidney Lee mentions the edition of 1650.¹⁰ One is led to conclude, therefore, that the passage in the chapbook indicates the correct reading found in other editions of the *Secret History*, from some one of which the chapbook was probably set up.

University of North Carolina

R. M. LUMIANSKY

THE "CLOSET" AND THE "STAGE" IN 1759

In *A History of Late Eighteenth Century Drama 1750-1800* Mr. Allardyce Nicoll has remarked that in the closing years of the eighteenth century "it became more or less universally understood that certain types of drama were fundamentally unactable, and 'closet' and 'theatre' appreciation were made the starting point from which a play was to be viewed." The distinguished historian of the English drama adds, moreover, that "there seems not the slightest doubt that the main cause contributing to this development was the unprecedented activity in the realm of translation—particularly of translation from the German—which extended from 1790 onwards."¹ Without attempting to minimize the influence of translations from the German, I should like to call attention to

⁹ Arber's ed., pp. 417, 433, 466

¹⁰ *DNB*, s. v. "Robert Devereaux, Second Earl of Essex." It may be that Lee means the chapbook and not the *Secret History* as Blair states (*op. cit.*, p. 37, note). Lee's title corresponds more nearly to that of the chapbook. Banks's failure to make use of Rutland's biographical account (see Blair, *op. cit.*, pp. 45-47), material admirably suited for him in its pathetic appeal, might be explained by his reference to a chapbook similar to the one described in this note, which omits Rutland's long history of her troubles, rather than to the *Secret History*. The whole matter of the relationship between this chapbook and the Elizabeth-Essex literature needs more study. I hope to shed some light on it in the near future

¹ P. 218. Cf. pp. 72-73.

two discussions of the drama in relation to the "closet" as opposed to the "stage," both of which appeared, by coincidence, in 1759.

The following criticism of Addison and his famous *Cato* (1713) occurs in Edward Young's epochal *Conjectures on Original Composition*.

There is this similitude between the poet and the play; as this is more fit for the closet than the stage, so, that shone brighter in private conversation than on the public scene. . . . This puts me in mind of *Plato*, who denied *Homer* to the public; that *Homer*, which, when in his closet, was rarely out of his hand. Thus, tho' *Cato* is not calculated to signalize himself in the warm emotions of the theatre, yet we find him a most amiable companion, in our calmer delights of recess.²

Addison's play, Young felt, lacked the "warm emotions of the theatre," the appeal to the sentiments of the audience. It had "much more of art, than nature in it." For this herald of Romanticism, *Cato* was too cold a tragedy for the stage; indeed, it was "an exquisite piece of statuary" rather than a play. *Cato* was too "artful," too sculptural. Already one hears the accents of such a Romantic critic as Hazlitt, for whom Addison's work was also "a marble slab," an ancient bas-relief—a drama only by courtesy.

Young all but explicitly differentiated between the "poetic" and the "stage" play:

he who sees not much beauty in [*Cato*], has no taste for poetry, he who sees nothing else, has no taste for the stage.³

None the less, the critic genuinely admired the poetry and the sculptural qualities of *Cato*: "as it is, like Pygmalion, we cannot but fall in love with it, and wish it were alive." Young still regarded the "stage" as the sphere of the dramatist, though he felt that certain plays were suited to the "closet" rather than to the "stage."

In the same year as the *Conjectures* Oliver Goldsmith discussed the "closet" drama in a quite different manner and with more far-reaching implications. In the interests of virtue and morality he recommended plays for one's "closet" in *An Enquiry into the Present State of Polite Learning*. In fact, he took the extreme position that plays are better read than seen, even stating that the

² *Edward Young's Conjectures on Original Composition*, ed. Edith Morley (Manchester, 1918), p. 40.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 41-42.

"theatre" exists as a means for getting plays into the hands of readers!

The success . . . of pieces upon the stage would be of little moment, did it not influence the success of the same piece in the closet. Nay, I think it would be more for the interests of virtue, if stage performances were read, not acted, made rather for companions in the cabinet [1st ed., closet] than on the theatre . . . But, whatever be the incentives to vice which are found at the theatre, public pleasures are generally less guilty than solitary ones. To make our solitary satisfaction truly innocent, the actor is useful, as by this means the poet's work makes its way from the stage to the closet, for all must allow, that the reader receives more benefit by perusing a well written play, than by seeing it acted.⁴

The statements come unexpectedly from the man who some fifteen years later wrote such a "low" comedy as *She Stoops to Conquer*, which was aimed at making an audience merry. But in the *Enquiry* at least Goldsmith advanced the opinion that the "stage" was secondary to the success of a play in the "closet." When one thinks thus of the reader as the ultimate goal of the dramatist, the "poetic" play is definitely encouraged. The way is opened for Lamb's view of things too abstract, too "deep," too "poetic," for the "stage" and also for Byron's "mental theatre."

The remarks of Young and Goldsmith strongly suggest that the elements in the pre-Romantic taste of the middle of the eighteenth century which they reflect, namely, the dissatisfaction with a "cold," static, and "unnatural" drama and the didactic impulse, should be mentioned among the contributors to the distinction between plays of the "closet" and of the "stage," which became so apparent late in the eighteenth century.

STEPHEN A. LARRABEE

Waterville, Maine

A DUBLIN MILTON ENTHUSIAST

In his recent article in *MLN*, "Three Imitations of Spenser,"¹ J. N. Hook so marshals his material that the reader unfamiliar with the work of Samuel Whyte (1733-1811), the author of the "Imitations" Mr. Hook discusses, would number Whyte among

⁴ *Works*, ed. Peter Cunningham (New York and London, 1900), III, 66.

¹ June, 1940, pp. 431-2.

the followers of Spenser. But examination of Whyte's work shows him chiefly a follower of Milton. The following evidence bears this statement out.

His borrowings from Milton for the verse of *The Shamrock: or Hibernian Cresses* (Dublin, 1772) are many and evident, although he acknowledges but four.² A few of the numerous unacknowledged ones are. "Sullen Roar" (p. 13, cf. "Penseroso," 76), "Thus Eden springs where late you found a Waste" (p. 14, cf. *P. R.*, 1, 7); "With many a Ringlet print the Grass" (p. 97; cf. "Allegro," 84-5); "There Wisdom, resting on her Gorgon Shield" (p. 218, cf. *Comus*, 447-8); "Save that the Nightingale, from yonder Spray" (p. 234; cf. Sonnet 1, 1), "And sweet, with thee, was Evening's Gentle Close" (p. 270; cf. *P. L.*, iv, 646-7). The description of the great temple in "Peruvian Letters," vii, pp. 406-7, is from Satan's temple in hell, *P. L.*, I, 710-30. It should be noted, however, that Whyte did not ape his idol in writing blank verse, he wrote only in rime. Subjoined to *The Shamrock* is an essay by Whyte on education, and in that part dealing with the instruction of young ladies he says that "the reading of Milton alone . . . might open to them almost the whole circle of human science."³ And he who teaches Milton must know the scriptures, the sciences, rhetoric, geography, history, heraldry, painting, etc., etc.⁴

In *A Collection of Poems* (Dublin, 1792-4),⁵ he records a performance of *Comus* at Marlay, the seat of David Latouche, on 30th September, 1776.⁶ In view of what Professor Havens has to say of the "Late Vogue of The Shorter Poems,"⁷ the sentiment of Whyte's prologue that "*Comus* . . . neglected lay, 'Till genuine taste . . . found its worth,"⁸ is of interest. The *Collection* also includes six sonnets, five of which have hitherto been overlooked. The sixth, a Spenserian, reprinted from *The Shamrock*, is noted by Mr. Hook. The other five sonnets are basically Petrarchan or

² Pp 41, 189, 270.

³ P. 501

⁴ *Ibid*

⁵ The list of subscribers includes "George Washington, President of Congress, America"

⁶ P. 61. The playbill, p. 60, lists Henry Gratton as a performer.

⁷ *The Influence of Milton on English Poetry*, Cambridge, 1922, pp 419-38.

⁸ P. 61.

Shakespearean in form, and sonnet III has an arrangement of the tercets that Milton uses several times. This fact, some Miltonic borrowings such as "to wallow in a sensual sty" (cf. *Comus*, 77), and vocative openings in four sonnets would suggest that Whyte wrote them under Milton's influence.

RUSSELL K. ALSPACH

University of Pennsylvania

"GILL MORICE" IN THE *RELIQUES* AGAIN

In a commendable article entitled "Percy's Reliques" Mr. L. F. Powell is greatly in error in his account of the text of "Gill Morice" as found in Percy's production. He states:

By the summer of 1758 he had started on the fatal course of giving to the world his 'Current impressions,' for in a mutilated letter . . . Percy tells Shenstone that he 'can think of no rhyme for Sun, in the 14th stanza of the Additions to Gill Morice,' adding 'but what if you find one for perfume. Query? "threads of Gold drawn from Minerva's loom" or something infinitely better.' This line, with the Scotticization of 'from' to 'frae,' is one of the sixteen additional lines impertinently intercalated into the Scottish ballad, which Percy describes (*Reliques*, iii. 93) as having been produced and handed about in manuscript, forgetting to tell us that production was his own.¹

But the additions were not written by Percy. In his first letter to Shenstone (November 24, 1757) Percy asks in a postscript for the text of "the old Scotch Song intitled Gil Morris" (which he had heard Shenstone read aloud), so that he might compare it with the version called Child Maurice in his Folio MS. Shenstone's reply (January 4, 1758) was accompanied by the requested ballad and also, as the printed correspondence shows, by a separate sheet (folio 9) headed, "Gill Morice / In place of y^e 14th stanza read y^e three following.—" and giving three eight-line stanzas numbered 14, 15, and 16.² Of these the last four lines of stanza 14, all of

¹ *The Library*, 4th Ser. ix, 115-16

² Hans Hecht, "Percy und Shenstone," *Quellen und Forschungen*, CHH, 7-8. It must be remembered that Mr. Powell was using the manuscript letters themselves, not Hecht's transcription, and that folio 9 may have been misplaced or removed before he consulted them, and that he did not notice the gap in numbering.

stanza 15, and the last four lines of stanza 16 form with one exception the sixteen lines "impertinently intercalated"³ into the ballad as it appears in the *Reliques*. The last four lines of stanza 14 read:

His hair was like the threads of gold
Shot frae y^e burning Sun,
His lips like roses diapping dew,
His breath was a perfume.

Above the last of these four lines was written as a variant, "When as his race (y^e Sun's) was run," affording Percy an example for free handling of the added lines, and between this stanza and the next, "I wish you w^d mend this Rhyme. 't is Pity" Thus Percy's emendation, "drawn from Minerva's loom," as suggested in his later letter to Shenstone⁴ and adopted in the *Reliques*, was merely what he had been asked to do, except that he replaced line 6 instead of line 8 of the stanza.

Percy did not think that the additions were written by Shenstone. Shenstone's comment on the false rhyme "'t is Pity" does not sound like a request for assistance on his own lines. And that is not all. The last two lines of stanza 16 read

He sang sae sweet it might dispell
A' rage but fell dispair.

To the last line Shenstone appended the comment "This, considering Addison's Note upon Milton's 'able to chase All sadness but despair,' [P. L. iv, 155-56] looks a little more modern yⁿ y^e rest, but may not be so"⁵ To this Percy replied (immediately after the lines quoted by Mr. Powell concerning the *loom* emendation):

³ With the *impertinence* of the additions anyone of the twentieth century would agree. The lines harmonize with the ballad as little as would Mrs. Malaprop in *Electra*, or chocolate sauce on roast beef.

⁴ Letter V, now fragmentary and undated, Hecht, *op cit*, p. 13.

⁵ In a footnote to the passage in the *Reliques* Percy expands and corrects the quotation "So Milton,

Vernal delight and joy able to drive
All sadness but despair"

The amazing thing is that Shenstone could believe, or even pretend to believe, that the additions were anything but modern. But the time-sense was slow in developing.

I can hardly help suspecting the last Line of Stanza 16th to be borrow'd from the Passage you refer to in Milton, among other for this reason the Expression in Milton has a propriety, which it has not in the Sonnet [1 e, song] Satan was litterally prey'd upon by despair, but the baron's passions, tho' of the black kind, could hardly have grown to that height so suddenly, as to settle into despair.⁶

These are not words Percy, uncertain about his own taste, would write concerning a production, however minor, of Shenstone, confident of the infallibility of his Percy's statement in his introduction to "Gill Morrice" in the *Reliques* is quite accurate: ". . . sixteen additional verses have been produced and handed about in manuscript, . . . (but are perhaps, after all, only an ingenious interpolation)."

The old notion about the unreliability of Percy's published statements dies hard.

LEAH DENNIS

Alabama College

MOSES BROWNE AND THE 1783 EDITION OF GILES AND PHINEAS FLETCHER

In the preface to his *Piscatory Eclogues* (1729), Moses Browne wrote an enthusiastically appreciative account of Phineas Fletcher's poetry and discussed the seventeenth-century poet with a knowledge that was rather unusual in that period, when most of the minor writers of the past were neglected and forgotten. Even at this early date he implied an intention to recall Phineas Fletcher to public notice "Methinks I should be glad if I could revive any just esteem for this great, unhappy Man,¹ whose Writings are almost lost to us, and which I would give the Reader a Taste of."² Such a taste he proceeded, in this same preface, to give the reader. He did not, however, quote his original verbatim but "improved" the text in accordance with his own sense of poetic fitness. For example, he altered "chaunt" to "sing"; "silver Medway's flood" to "Medway's silver flood"; "noon-tides rage" to "noon-tides heat";

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

¹ Browne was under the impression that Phineas Fletcher was the subject of Milton's *Lycidas*.

² [Browne, Moses], *Piscatory Eclogues* (London, 1729), 25.

"troublesome world" to "vexatious world", and "His bed of wool yields safe and quiet sleep" to "His bed more safe than soft yields quiet sleep." Moreover, Browne again engaged in precisely this same kind of textual redaction in his edition of Walton's *Complete Angler* (1750).³ The similarity between this treatment of an author's text and the editorial method employed in the anonymous 1783 edition of Giles Fletcher's *Christ's Victory and Triumph* and Phineas Fletcher's *Purple Island*,⁴ and the fact that Browne was well acquainted with the Fletchers' works, suggest the possibility that he was the anonymous editor.

In addition, the pious tone of the preface and of the textual alterations, and the religious nature of the poems selected strongly suggest that the editor of the 1783 Fletchers was a churchman. And whoever the editor was, he was probably an intimate friend of the Reverend James Hervey, for in his preface to Phineas Fletcher's poem the editor confessed his indebtedness to Hervey: "In the *Letters* written [by Hervey] to his Friends, we find mention made of this very Poem, which was put into his Hands a few Weeks before his Decease with which he was so well pleased, that he intended revising it for the Press; and to add another Poem entitled *Christ's Victory and Triumph in Heaven and on Earth*."⁵ Even

³ "Mr Walton was a Writer of the true pastoral Character, in which perhaps he has not his Parallel; yet, through a willing Inattention, and different Mode of Language then in use, some frequent Inaccuracies and Redundancies have insinuated themselves, which I should be injurious to him as his Editor, not to retouch and prune away . . . My Aim was, but to file off that Rust, which Time fixes on the most curious and finished Things, and to imitate in this the Pains an elaborate Workman would bestow in repairing some Pile of exquisite antient Architecture or the Art a judicious Painter would be supposed to use, in refitting up a decayed and curious Portrait of some great Master" Walton's *Complete Angler*, ed. Moses Browne (London, 1759), xiii

⁴ See my "Elizabethan Poetry 'Improved,'" *MP*, xxxvii (1940), 357-69, which is, in part, an analysis of the textually unwarranted alterations in this edition.

⁵ Hervey's entire letter, incidentally, is an interesting clarification of the kind of eighteenth-century editorial policy employed in the 1783 Fletchers (see my article, *supra*). After urging his anonymous correspondent to reprint *Christ's Victory* and *The Purple Island*, "properly revised and altered," he writes "Had I been in perfect health, and disengaged from other employment, I question whether I should not have retouched the poetry, changed several of the obsolete words, illustrated the obscure

in an effort to apologize for the obsolete language of the poems, the editor called upon a remark that Hervey had made "on a similar Occasion." It was through the encouragement of Hervey that Moses Browne took orders in the English church; and in 1753 he became Hervey's curate.

It seems probable, then, that Browne transmitted to Hervey his own earlier interest in the Fletchers and was encouraged in turn to edit their poems,⁶ but delayed until he was prompted to carry out the project by the appearance in 1771 of Lord Woodhouselee's edition of Phineas Fletcher's *Piscatory Eclogues*. The only detail that seems to oppose this ascription is the fact that the dedicatory poem, which, according to the title page, is by the editor, is signed "P. B."

EARL R. WASSERMAN

University of Illinois

ON THE SERIAL PUBLICATION OF *OLIVER TWIST*

In his Introduction to *Oliver Twist*, published in 1897, Charles Dickens the Younger states that his father's story began in *Bentley's Miscellany* in February, 1837. Speaking of an interruption in the serialization of the story that occurred in June of that year, he says. "No instalment of the story was published in this month, but it was resumed in July, and continued without interruption until the appearance in the magazine of its concluding chapter in March, 1839."¹ The editor of *Oliver Twist* in the National Library

passages by occasional notes . . . Could not Rivington get some one to make these necessary alterations? Or, if he does not care to engage in it, would not Dodsley undertake it, who is himself a poet, and very capable of abridging it in some places, enlarging it in others, and thoroughly correcting the whole?

Methinks if a subscription to modernize valuable authors, and thus rescue them from the pit of oblivion, was properly set on foot . . . it would meet with due encouragement" (*The Whole Works of the Late Rev James Hervey*, London, 1819, VI, 392) This is the most forthright contemporary statement I have been able to find of this type of eighteenth-century editing

⁶ Hervey had once before commissioned Browne to engage in poetical work, a translation of Zimmermann's *De Eminentia Cogitationes Christi* See Hervey, *op cit*, 374

¹ *The Adventures of Oliver Twist*, London, 1924 [first copyright, 1897], p. xiv.

Edition of Dickens's *Works* follows Charles Dickens the Younger in part when he says, "it [*Oliver Twist*] ran as a serial in the pages of 'Bentley's Miscellany' from January [*sic.* February] 1837 to March 1839."² On the same points Mr. John C. Eckel says "Publication of the [Bentley's] *Miscellany* began in January, 1837, and in the second number was begun the printing of *Oliver Twist*. This continued monthly until March, 1839, with the elapse of one month occasioned by the death of Mary Hogarth"³ This statement is followed by Messrs. Hatton and Cleaver when they assert that *Oliver Twist* was published "firstly, as a serial in *Bentley's Miscellany* from February, 1837 (except June, 1837) to March, 1839."⁴

From the preceding, we note these points of agreement (1) three of the above mentioned authorities agree that the first installment of *Oliver Twist* appeared in the February 1837 Number of *Bentley's Miscellany*; (2) three of them agree that it suffered one interruption—its non-appearance in June, 1837; and (3) all agree that it ended in the March 1839 Number.

Since practically all copies of *Bentley's Miscellany* for the period of Dickens's editorship and shortly thereafter have been stripped of their covers and date lines and have been bound into half-year volumes, the exact extent of each monthly number is difficult to determine. Fortunately the principal stories were accompanied by illustrations that are dated consistently from January 1, 1837, to November 1, 1838, inclusive. From that time onward, the plates illustrating *Oliver Twist* bear only the date of the year; yet the portion for December, 1838, can be dated easily and accurately by its position in the physical format. Beginning with January 1, 1839, William Harrison Ainsworth's *Jack Shepherd* becomes the leading story in the *Miscellany*, stands at the beginning of each monthly number, and is accompanied by a plate bearing the day, month, and year of publication. So it furnishes an accurate means for dating correctly and determining the exact extent of each monthly number.

² New York, [1928], 20 vols, III, [x].

³ *The First Editions of the Writings of Charles Dickens*, Revised and Enlarged, New York, 1932, p. 59.

⁴ *A Bibliography of the Periodical Works of Charles Dickens*, London, 1933, p. 215.

The authorities mentioned above speak of only one interruption in the serial publication of *Oliver Twist*—that for the month of June, 1837, whereas, there were three interruptions. The first came as a consequence of the death of Mary Hogarth, the young sister-in-law of Dickens, who lived in his home. In place of the customary installment for number VI, June, 1837, there appeared the announcement:

Since the appearance of the last number of this work the editor has to mourn the sudden death of a very dear young relative to whom he was most affectionately attached . . . He has been compelled to seek a short interval of rest and quiet. The next number will be conducted by him, as usual, and the adventures of *Oliver Twist* will be continued.

In still another place there was the statement:

Oliver Twist We beg to announce that the "Adventures of the Parrish Boy" under the above title, will be continued in our next *Miscellany*. The melancholy domestic afflictions which Mr. Dickens has just sustained prevented the possibility of any mental exertion for the present number.⁵

The second interruption in the serial publication of *Oliver Twist*—unmentioned by any of the four authorities quoted above—occurred when the October 1837 Number carried this announcement: "*Oliver Twist* will be continued by Mr. Dickens in the next number of the *Miscellany*, and after that from month to month as usual. The great length of the proceedings of the Mudfog Association prevented the insertion of the usual continuation this month."⁶ Although Mr. Ley called attention to this second interruption in 1928, it was not noticed by Mr. Eckel or Messrs. Hatton and Cleaver, publishing respectively in 1932 and 1933. This second interruption is more difficult to understand than the first. The only possible explanation is that the work of writing *Pickwick*, editing *The Memoirs of Grimaldi*, supplying an original article each month for the *Miscellany*, and editing the last named work proved too great a task for Dickens, with the result that the printer's dead-line caught him short of material for *Oliver Twist*.

So far as I have been able to ascertain, no one has previously called attention to the third interruption, the omission of this story from the September, 1838, number. The general contents of

⁵ J. W. T. Ley, ed., *The Life of Charles Dickens by John Forster*, London, 1928, p. 99, n. 101.

⁶ *Ibid.*

Volume iv for the last half of 1838 lists *Olver Twist* as appearing on pages 1, 105, 209, 313, 417, and 521. But a reference to the text shows that *Oliver Twist* did not appear on page 209—or anywhere else in the September issue. In the place of the usual installment, stands Dickens's "Full Report of the Second Meeting of the Mudfog Association for the Advancement of Everything" and continues to page 227. Standing at the head of this paper is an illustration by Cruikshank dated September 1, 1838.

There is no ready explanation of this third interruption in the serial publication of *Olver Twist*. It is interesting that in each of the last two interruptions the Mudfog Association papers should fill up the space ordinarily occupied by *Olver*. We may surmise that the printer's dead-line caught Dickens a second time. But why? Just at this time Dickens was having serious trouble with Bentley over his contracts. He had agreed to edit the *Miscellany*, write *Olver Twist* as a serial for that journal, furnish an original article for each monthly number of the journal, and write a new story—*Barnaby Rudge*—for Bentley. Without going into the question of the justice or the injustice of Dickens's position regarding his contracts, it is still true that he was laboring under what Forster called "a nightmare agreement."⁷ Most of these contracts had been made before Dickens—or perhaps Bentley, either—was aware of his value as a writer; for the heyday of *Pickwick* had not then arrived. When Dickens realized that his efforts were worth several times what he was receiving it is probable that he became restive, and that this discontented restivity prevented his finishing all of his heavy tasks on time, with the result that he failed to get the material for *Olver* into the hands of the printer before the latter went to press. It is probable that an examination of an unbound copy of the *Miscellany* for September, 1838, would reveal a note or an announcement that would explain the omission; but at present I can offer only conjecture.

⁷ The Dickens-Bentley contracts are fully discussed by Forster and his editor, Mr J W T Ley, in *The Life of Charles Dickens*, pp 98 to 100, footnote 101, Walter Dexter, "Dickens's Agreements with Bentley," *The Dickensian*, XXXI (Autumn Number, 1935), 241-254, Dexter, "The Agreements with Richard Bentley," *The Dickensian*, XXXIII (Summer Number, 1937), 199-204, George Bentley, "Mr Dickens and Mr Bentley," *The Times* (Friday, December 8, 1871), 6; and Gerald G. Grubb, "Charles Dickens Journalist," Typewritten Dissertation, The University of North Carolina, 1940, pp. 155-169

We can now turn to the third point of agreement among the four authorities quoted at the beginning of this note—namely, that the serial publication of *Oliver Twist* came to an end in the March 1839 Number. A glance at the final installment of *Oliver* shows that it appeared not in the March but in the April issue, v, 416-425. Since January 1, 1839, Ainsworth's *Jack Shepherd* had been the leading story in the *Miscellany*, standing at the beginning of each number, and accompanied by a dated etching. This last installment of *Oliver Twist* stands between the *Shepherd* plates for April 1 and May 1, 1839.

GERALD GILES GRUBB

Howard College

IVANHOE AND SIMMS' VASCONSELOS

A clear example of the frequently-discussed influence of Scott on Simms¹ seems to be shown by a comparison of the Passage of Arms at Ashby in *Ivanhoe* with the tournament of Havana in *Vasconcelos* (1854), pictured by Simms as immediately preceding the departure of De Soto for Florida. In both of these episodes the scene is elaborately described, with particular attention to the heraldic devices of the contestants, in both, the tourney proper is supplemented by games characteristic of the *locale*—in *Ivanhoe* by an archery contest, in *Vasconcelos* by a bullfight. Both novels employ the chivalric convention of having the victorious knight crowned by a Queen of Beauty whom he has previously chosen, but the details differ. *Ivanhoe* chooses Rowena as Queen after his victory in the individual jousts, and only through the fortunes of combat is he crowned as the hero in the *mêlée* of the second day; *Vasconcelos* must demonstrate his prowess on only one day and is crowned as champion immediately following his selection of Olivia de Alvaro as Queen. In each novel the rewarding of the victor—which brings two lovers face to face—is dramatically interrupted: *Ivanhoe* faints from his wounds, Olivia “from the conflict of emotions which she could no longer sustain and live.”²

¹ See, for example, Grace Landrum, “Sir Walter Scott and the Old South,” *American Literature*, II (November, 1930), 261

² *Vasconcelos*, Chapter XIX, p. 247. The “conflict” is between Olivia's love for Philip and her sense of guilt at having been, albeit unwillingly, the victim of her uncle's incestuous lust.

Far more convincing than these general similarities—which might be dismissed as coincidental, even if they were not overlooked among the differences of setting and of the procedure in the tournament—are two similarities in the details of the action. The dramatic moment of the first day at Ashby is the combat between Ivanhoe and Bois-Guilbert. After both combatants break their lances cleanly in the first course, Ivanhoe shifts his attack from shield to helmet, “a mark more difficult to hit, but which, if attained, rendered the shock more irresistible.” The lance-point strikes fairly between the bars of the Norman’s visor, and the bursting of his saddle-girth rolls him ignominiously in the dust.³ Philip de Vasconselos, after twice shattering lances with his friend Nuno de Tobar, shifts his attack from the shield (“the common mark in the tournament of that day, the want of exercise making the *attemt* more difficult when addressed to the gorget, or the helm”) to the visor—first signalling his intention to his friendly rival. In the charge Philip skilfully handles his shield to avoid De Tobar’s thrust, while his own lance-point, “admirably delivered, was riveted in the bars of his antagonist’s visor, so firmly, and so fairly, that there was no escape, no evasion of it possible; and the gallant Nuno was borne from his saddle”⁴

In his combat with De Grantmesnil, one of the lesser of the Norman challengers, Ivanhoe exhibits the courtesy, as well as the courage of knighthood. De Grantmesnil’s horse, “young and violent, reared and plunged in the course of his career so as to disturb the rider’s aim” Ivanhoe, declining the advantage afforded him by this mishap, offers the chance of a second encounter to De Grantmesnil, who declines it, “avowing himself vanquished as much by the courtesy as by the address of his opponent.”⁵ A similar incident, though treated in greater detail, occurs in *Vasconselos*, immediately after the overthrow of De Tobar, to save the gallant but portly veteran Don Vasco de Poicallos from the mortification of being unhorsed. “His steed, which was as high-spirited as he was powerful, trod upon the barbed head of a broken lance which had been partly buried out of sight beneath the sands of the arena . . . and . . . became suddenly unmanageable.” More

³ *Ivanhoe*, Chapter VIII (Oxford, 1912), p. 90

⁴ *Vasconselos*, Chapter XVII, pp. 227-28

⁵ *Ivanhoe*, Chapter VIII, p. 92.

spectacular in his horsemanship than *Ivanhoe*, Vasconcelos suddenly reins in his charger, leaps to the ground, and grasps the bridle of his opponent's horse. Don Vasco alights, "and gratefully acknowledging the assistance rendered, he at the same time acknowledged himself vanquished." Spared some of the disgrace of defeat, the veteran, who has previously distinguished himself in the lists, declines the suggestion of Vasconcelos that he continue the combat on another horse.⁶

That the resemblances between the tournaments are not purely fortuitous may be inferred from Simms' familiarity with *Ivanhoe*, which he cites as a model historical romance in the letter to Professor Dickson, prefatory to the 1854 revision of *The Yemassee*, in the same year in which *Vasconcelos* was published. Furthermore, in the address "History for the Purposes of Art," published nine years earlier, he terms *Ivanhoe* "one of the most perfect specimens of the romance that we possess," with the reservation, expressed in a footnote, that it is "impaired, however, by the single piece of mummery toward the close, which embodies the burial rites of Athelstane and his resurrection. But for this every way unbecoming episode, the romance would be nearly perfect."⁷

It should not be concluded that Simms deliberately set out to imitate Scott's description of the tournament at Ashby. Probably, realizing that he lacked the intimacy with his subject that had characterized his tales of the Southwest and of Revolutionary South Carolina, he turned, consciously or unconsciously, to the author who had popularized the romance of medieval chivalry. Under the circumstances it is not surprising that this elaboration of detail—the rationalization of accidents and the analysis of motives—somewhat destroys the sensation of spirited action which Scott, using his details more sparingly, successfully maintains. A difference in tone is also noticeable except for the combat between Philip and his brother, following the retirement of Don Vasco, the jousts at Havana are less fierce than those at Ashby. The Spanish and Portuguese knights contest the lists honorably, as befitting one of the last displays of chivalric splendor, but even in the intensity of combat they remember that they are brothers-

⁶ *Vasconcelos*, Chapter XVIII, pp. 233-34

⁷ *Views and Reviews in American Literature*, first series (New York, 1845), p. 33.

in-arms; at the height of the feudal age, in a recently conquered country where differences of descent might imply differences of allegiance, the contests in which *Ivanhoe* distinguished himself—an English knight loyal to King Richard, against the Norman retainers of the usurper John—fall little short of personal duels. But though this difference of tone is proper, a reader of the two accounts is compelled to conclude that it was a mistake for Simms to leave the Southern woods, which he knew from intimate experience, to write about the chivalric tournament, an alien tradition which he could know only through books.

RAVEN I McDAVID, JR.

Southwestern Louisiana Institute

REVIEWS

Goethe's Works with the exception of Faust, A Catalogue compiled by members of the Yale University Library staff. Edited, arranged and supplied with literary notes and preceded by an introduction and a biographical sketch of William A. Speck by CARL FREDERICK SCHREIBER. New Haven. Yale University Press, 1940. Pp xlv + 239, 17 plates, folio. \$10.00. [The William A. Speck Collection of Goetheana in the Yale University Library.]

The Goetheana gathered by the late William A. Speck constitute, without doubt, one of the largest and most important Goethe collections not merely in this country, but in the world. The present monumental volume is to be followed by three others, to be devoted respectively to *Faust*, Biographical Material, Addenda, and a General Index. The classification of the material is based in general on Goedeke, with the collected editions of the works at the head, followed by the collections of poems and then by the other works in the order of their composition. With each work are given the translations, illustrations, musical settings and the like. Certain departures from Goedeke's arrangement have deliberately been made, as the editor points out on page xvii:

It seemed to me illuminating to bring together all the materials relating to a given Goethe work; a general survey, let us say, of *Werther*, first the original work; then all that has been done with it in the way of

criticism, translation, illustration, musical composition, dramatization, and parody; and finally to introduce the holograph material bearing on *Werther* at points where it would shed the most light. Surely the *Werther* should then stand forth boldly and vitally. The same is true of the *Werther* illustrations by Chodowiecky which are accompanied by a running comment to point out the history of these charming engravings. A new treatment of the numerous reprintings of the *Werther* translations has been introduced. The life of a translation from the first printing on through the succeeding issues gives a vivid picture of its success with the reading public. The texts of all anonymous issues have been carefully compared and credited to the original translator.

It may be remarked, by the way, that the *Werther* collection is one of the largest ever assembled, more than 600 numbers of the total 2372 being devoted to this work.

We owe a debt of gratitude to Professor Schreiber and his collaborators for the accurate and consistent collation of all the items of any importance—a collation which is not always to be found in such detail in the catalogues of other Goethe collections. It is impossible here to enter into detailed descriptions, I shall limit myself to supplementary data gained by comparison with copies in my own collection.

No. 2. *D. Goethens Schriften Erster Theil*. Title and signature A have been set twice, the first set-up (h^{1a}) existing in my two copies, the second (h^{1b}) in the copy of Cornell University 1419 A¹: Page 4, 4 *deinen Freund* h^{1a} *deinem Freund* h^{1b} 6, 14 *beschäftigten* h^{1a} *beschäftigen* h^{1b} 6, 23 *dem besten* h^{1a} *den besten* h^{1b} 8, 12 *zugethan*, h^{1a} *zugethan* h^{1b} . At the end of the *Zweyter Theil* one of my copies contains a leaf (superscription and 9 lines of text) that is missing in the Yale copy, as well as in the collections of Hirzel, Friedrich Meyer, and Kippenberg:

Nachricht an den Buchbinder Da aus Nachlässigkeit des Setzers, mit den Sertenzahlen im 2ten Theil der Fehler begangen worden, daß er statt pagina 230 bis 288, pagina 130 bis 188 gesetzt hat, folglich auch dieser Fehler auf der Kupferplatte des Clavigo und der Elmire begangen ist, so werden die Herren Buchbinder sich in Acht nehmen, daß sie diese zwey Kupfer auf die gehörigen Seiten bringen

In the *Dritter Theil* one of my copies has a blank leaf at the end, belonging to signature P. The two plates, missing in the Yale copy, are marked respectively *III. Th. Pag. 85.* and *III. Th. pag. 160.* Each is by *D. Chodowiecki del. D. Berger sc.*

No. 3. *J. W. Goethens Schriften Erster Band*: one of my copies is unbound and unopened, and one can here see that the frontispiece forms the first leaf of signature A: the Yale copy is therefore complete.

No. 12. In addition to a copy conforming to the description in the Catalogue, I possess a second copy as follows: *Goethe's Schriften. Erster [— Vierter] Band*. Vignette: *J. W. Meil inv. del. et sc. Mit Rom. Kaiserl. allergnädigstem Privilegio. Leipzig, bey Georg Joachim Göschen, 1787.* (This date is in all four volumes.)

Following the title, in fact forming a double leaf with it, is a *Kaiserliches allergnädigstes Privilegium* with the date November 8, 1805. The title-pages, despite the date 1787, must therefore have been printed in 1805, or later, and then added to the remainders of the original edition. Textually, volume 1 shows three different printings of signature,* containing title and *Zuerkning*, and three different set-ups of signature Z (pp. 353-360), whilst the rest of the volume is identical in the three copies in my possession. The printing designated by s¹ has the vignette on the title-page marked: *J. W. Meil inv. F. Grogory sc*. In s² and s³ the vignette is marked: *J. W. Meil inv. del. et sc.*; on the title page of s¹ the name of the publisher appears as *Goschen*, in s² and s³ as *Göschchen*. In s¹ and s³ signature Z is marked *Goethe's W. I. Band*, in s² the spelling is *Göthe's W. I. Band*. The extra leaf with the *Privilegium* is found only in s³. Characteristic readings are page vii, 9 *sehnen?* s^{1 3}, *sehnen*. s² viii, 9 *Verzeih* s¹, *Verzeih's* s^{2 3} x, 4 *frischer-neuter* s^{1 3} *frisch erneuter* s² x, 5 *Fruchten schmuckt*, | s¹ *Fruchten | schmuckt*, s^{2 3} 353, 16 *laßt's* s^{1 3} *laß'ts* s² 355, 8 *Meuter* s^{1 3} *Meuteer* s² 357, 29 *schwere* s^{1 2} *schweren* s³ 358, 8 *Paket* s^{1 2} *Packet* s³.

Nos. 28-31. Volumes 1-10 of the edition in small octavo exist in as many as three different printings, the characteristics of which cannot be enumerated here: the latest printing can easily be identified by the date 1828 instead of 1827.

Nos. 139 ff. The Yale collection lacks the very first edition of the Poems *Goethe's Gedichte. Tübingen in der J. G. Cotta'schen Buchhandlung* 1812. 4 leaves, 408 pages 26 signatures, the last with only 4 leaves. The text is identical with that of A² of the *Werke* of 1806, only the signatures having been changed from *Goethe's Werke I.* to *Goethe's Gedichte*. Both editions have the incorrect page number 313 instead of 331.

No. 143. The text of the *Gedichte* of 1815, despite the different number of pages, is from the same set-up as volumes 1 and 2 of the *Werke* of this year, cf. *MLN.*, xxxi, 278.

No. 146. That Goethe had no hand in the publication of the *Gedichte* of 1829 is indicated by a remark in his letter to Cotta of October 27, 1829 (*Briefe* XLVI, 124): "Von meinen kleinen *Gedichten* und von *Hermann und Dorothea* sind neuerlich, wie ich sehe, einzelne Abdrucke erschienen. Hiervon mochte ich Dieselben um einige Exemplare ansprechen."

Nos. 700, 701. Two copies of *Von Deutscher Art und Kunst*, 1773, are listed, with the statement for 701 "Page number on p. 8 not printed." What we should like to know is, whether these two copies constitute different printings (which have hitherto been unknown), or whether it is the same set-up, with just this otherwise unimportant difference in pagination?

No. 949. The date of *Der Deutsche Merkur* is put in brackets [1773], as if it had been supplied by the editor: in four copies

before me the date is given, moreover, volumes 1 and 2 have *Deutsche*, and not *Teutsche*.

Nos. 1713, 1714. *Scherz, List und Rache*. It would be interesting to know whether these two copies, one of which is simply called "Variant," are from the same set-up or not. My copy has the reading *Er ist bitter* of No. 1713, and the correct pagination of No. 1714.

No. 2163. The *Morgenblatt für gebildete Stände*, 1814, whose place of publication is given in the catalogue as *Stuttgart* (with a question mark), actually has on its title-page the imprint: *Tubingen*.

W. KURRELMAYER

Chaucer's Troilus, A Study in Courtly Love. By THOMAS A. KIRBY. (Louisiana State University Studies, No. 39) University, Louisiana Louisiana State University Press, 1940. Pp. ix + 337. \$3.00.

The purpose of this monograph, as stated in the Preface, is "to make a study of the courtly love tradition and of Chaucer's *Troilus* in the light of that tradition, especially to investigate its relation to the *Filostrato* of Boccaccio and to determine the nature and the effect of the changes which the English poet saw fit to make."

Part I (87 pages) reviews the origins and development of the conventions of courtly love, with chapters on Ovid, the Troubadours, Chrétien de Troyes, Andreas Capellanus, and the authors of the *dolce stil nuovo* in Italy. These chapters, based on a first-hand examination of the texts concerned supplemented by generous quotations from the best modern scholars who have discussed them, gives a scholarly conspectus of the subject which will be very useful to graduate students who may wish to get it up in preparation for the ordeal of a doctoral examination. One is surprised to find no treatment of the *Roman de la Rose*, which Professor Kirby has deliberately excluded as not "especially significant" for his purposes.

Part II (28 pages) consists of a single chapter devoted to the *Filostrato* as "a typical courtly love document." This is perhaps the most useful chapter of the book. Boccaccio's graceful poem has usually been discussed chiefly as a foil to Chaucer's much more brilliant reworking of it. Here it is analyzed as a narrative poem in its own right, all reference to Chaucer being reserved for later chapters. The student of *Troilus* will find it much to his advantage to read this single-eyed analysis of its Italian original.

Part III (164 pages) is devoted to a minutely detailed analysis of Chaucer's *Troilus*. Long chapters are devoted to the characters

of Pandarus, Criseyde, and Troilus, with a short chapter on Diomedes. The structural pattern of each of these chapters is the same: the actions and utterances of each character in turn are exhaustively reviewed from first appearance to last; in every episode the extent to which Chaucer follows or departs from his Italian model is pointed out, by careful reference to the pronouncements of Andreas Capellanus, who is assumed to speak with final and indisputable authority on everything pertaining to courtly love, it is discovered that in most instances Chaucer has enhanced the courtliness of the love story. This is a conclusion which few competent critics would dispute in its main contention, though they may question some of the detailed demonstrations.

The method which Mr. Kirby has chosen for his exposition has some serious disadvantages. Page after page of alternating quotation and summary paraphrase makes for dreary reading (Pandarus requires 71 pages and Criseyde an ensuing 54). The separate examination of the chief personages involves some unfortunate repetition, and, a more serious matter, leaves little opportunity to assess the tone and temper of Chaucer's poem in its total impression upon the reader. The analysis of the characters tends to the mechanical rather than the imaginative. Pandarus is absolved of all obloquy as go-between because Andreas Capellanus permits an *internuntius*. Would he have thought that the lady's guardian uncle could appropriately fill the rôle? Troilus's long discussion of predestination is justified on the ground that courtly love is "quite opposed to freedom of the will" because, "as the slave of his lady, [the lover] is absolutely powerless and is able to do nothing of his own choice" (p. 262). Criseyde is to be condemned "solely because in granting her love to Diomedes she offends against one of the cardinal principles of the courtly love system" (p. 231). But is not failure to keep one's solemnly plighted faith cause for condemnation under most codes of human behavior? If she is "the greatest of courtly love heroines" (p. 237), why does the God of Love in the *Legend of Good Women* rebuke Chaucer for writing of her?

One would be glad to know how whole-heartedly Chaucer accepted as humanly valid the conventions of courtly love as codified, two hundred years before his time, by Andrew the Chaplain. Were they applicable at the court of Richard II, or did they suggest rather the long-ago days of King Arthur and the more distant romantic past of ancient Troy or Athens? There is, at least, plenty of evidence in Chaucer's poetry that he did not agree with Andrew that courtly love is necessarily incompatible with marriage.

ROBERT K. ROOT

Princeton University

Civilisation Américaine. By BERNARD FAY. Paris: Sagittaire, 1939. Pp. 329 30 fr.

The Small Town in American Literature. By IMA HONAKER HERRON. Durham Duke University Press, 1939. Pp. xvii + 477. \$4.00.

The New England Mind The Seventeenth Century. By PERRY MILLER. New York: Macmillan, 1939. Pp. xi + 528. \$3.75.

Although these three volumes are concerned with various aspects of the American mind, they present striking contrasts in scope and method. *Civilisation Américaine*, a panorama of our complex democracy, is an example of the peculiarly French powers of broad synthesis and shrewd analysis. *The Small Town in American Literature* is a carefully documented account of the village pattern in our national letters from the third quarter of the eighteenth century to the present time. Easily the most distinguished is *The New England Mind*, a brilliant dissection of the anatomy of Puritan thought as it is revealed in the outpouring of literature in seventeenth century England and America.

The slightest of these studies has the most ambitious aim. In a lively book of three hundred pages, M. Fay has attempted to cope with the vast subject of American civilization. From Harvard to Hollywood, the author's witty and often penetrating commentary ranges over a variety of topics. Illuminating as many of these comments are, American readers will be likely to offer amused protests at the statement (p. 216) that several members of the Princeton faculty were seriously alarmed at the "invasion" of New Jersey by "inhabitants" from Mars. Equally open to objection is the observation (p. 247) that *True Confessions* and other magazines of this spawn are only a trifle less respectable than *The Saturday Evening Post*. Pleasantly flattering, but uninformed, is the remark (p. 195) that the *New York Times* is piously read each morning by plumbers and negro chamber-maids. M. Fay's charge that American literature is neglected by our students, less true now than a decade ago, is not without some foundation in fact. He also deplores the over-emphasis upon English literary history at the expense of American literary history which remains a spattering of names without much reference to the special conditions which produced them. This is shrewd criticism, but the author devotes a scant thirteen pages to contemporary letters, approximately a third of the space given to journalism. Although M. Fay considers American drama to be the most vital of our arts, he dismisses Eugene O'Neill (whose name is misspelled) in less than three lines.

The author was badly served by his proof-reader. It is disconcerting to encounter a temperamental version of names as important

as Abraham Lincoln, Benjamin Harrison, Charles Eliot, James Bryant Conant, Edith Wharton, Willa Cather, John Dos Passos, William Faulkner, Harry Emerson Fosdick, John Singer Sargent, and George Gershwin. The index is far from adequate. These faults are perhaps captious in as disarming a book as *Civilisation Américaine*. If M. Fay has not exhausted his subject, neither has he exhausted his reader. He has offered a bright, and, in the main, a generous estimate of contemporary life in the United States.

Popular criticism has too often assumed that "the home town mind" was first attacked in such comparatively recent works as *Spoon River Anthology* and *Main Street*. This impression has been happily corrected by Dr. Herron in *The Small Town in American Literature*. Although she does not maintain that the small town has played as significant a part as the frontier, her thoroughgoing survey deserves a place beside the earlier works upon the importance of frontier and prairie in the revaluation of American literature. The literary evolution of the small town and its prototype, the village, is traced through three stages: first, that of eighteenth century imitations of the pattern of English village life, second, that of the shifting conventions and backgrounds motivated by the recession of the frontier, and, third, the spread of the urban spirit with its drab aftermath of standardization. Dr. Herron sees in the present day "return to the land" by disillusioned city folk a new chapter in "the variously patterned story of convention and revolt." This study possesses all the virtues and very few of the vices of the monograph method. It is meticulously documented; it offers a wealth of suggestive bibliographical information; it neglects none of the important attitudes to small town ways; and, above all, it illuminates as well as covers the subject. The author's absorbing interest in her theme, however, tempted her occasionally to over-emphasize the factor of setting in works which are concerned only incidentally with environment. Although she is aware of the limitations of her "historical-geographical approach" to the subject, this method has resulted in a considerable amount of repetition. Moreover, interpretative commentary is sometimes sacrificed in order to include a spattering of titles which might have been more properly reserved for the bibliography.

Although Dr. Herron found fiction to offer the richest source of evidence, she has not done full justice to the revelation of the small town mind in the popular, sentimental, and occasionally sub-literary novels of the 1840's and 1850's. The very few inaccuracies are minor ones. *Alonzo and Melissa* should have been attributed to Isaac Mitchell, not to Daniel Jackson. It appeared in 1811, not in 1824. Such slips in no way detract from the high competence of the study, which should prove eminently useful to students of American social and literary history.

Historians of American literature have been too intent upon esthetic values and too exclusively concerned with *belles-lettres* to explore thoroughly and sympathetically the thorny province of our intellectual origins. As a result, beginnings of American thought have usually been dismissed as flat and unprofitable. It is the chief significance of Dr. Perry Miller's *The New England Mind* that it provides a magnificently analytical appraisal of the amalgam of Puritan thought in the seventeenth century. Interpreters of our national mind have neglected the fact that its roots are firmly planted in the seventeenth century. Professor Miller has taken Puritanism for granted as "one of the major expressions of the Western intellect" and he has assumed "that it achieved an organized synthesis of concepts which are fundamental to our culture." In his task of classifying and defining these concepts, the author has resorted to a topical analysis of leading ideas under the general divisions of Religion and Learning, Cosmology, Anthropology, and Sociology. Faced with the problem of finding modern equivalents for the Puritan philosophical and theological vocabulary, Dr. Miller wisely refused to translate seventeenth century terminology into contemporary phrases. Instead, he has been triumphantly successful in clarifying the "state of mind" of the Puritans as the best means of arriving at the issues which agitated Puritan thought.

Students nurtured on the old commonplaces will find many of their tenets challenged at every turn. It is only when the New Englanders are studied as heirs of the Renaissance, as disciples of Erasmus and Colet, and as eager students of classical literature, that the inadequacy of the traditional label of Calvinism as a measure of their intellectual life becomes apparent. The author has gone far to explain the seeming paradox that "Puritan writers can pity the insignificance of human reason, and in the next breath sing the praises of the human mind." Without minimizing the dominant strain of piety, Dr. Miller has demonstrated the "toughness" of the rational element which construed conversion as "an enlightening of the mind" as well as "a humbling of the heart." The author's wide scrutiny of the whole range of Puritan writing is never so impressive as in his demonstration of the importance of the intellectual heritage in molding the life of New England.

As important a book as *The New England Mind* deserves a separate review and a more searching analysis than the limitations of this short notice allow. Professor Miller has written a definitive chapter in the history of ideas, and has made a distinguished contribution to American scholarship.

HERBERT BROWN

Bowdoin College

Revivals and Importations of French Comedies in England, 1749-1800. By WILLARD AUSTIN KINNE. New York. Columbia University Press, 1939. Pp. xvi + 310. \$3 00.

The scope of this study, suggested by its title, is more specifically indicated by the author's statement of his purpose "to give a year-to-year account of those acted comedies or comic entertainments which were either avowedly drawn from France or were ascribed to a French source by eighteenth-century reviewers" (p. ix). Limiting himself to the half century from the London theatrical season of 1749-1750 to that of 1799-1800, Mr. Kinne has systematically considered not only the new comedies which were indebted to French sources but also the pieces which, although first produced before 1749-1750, were revived during or after that season. The year-to-year account is organized into five chapters, each of which covers a decade, within each chapter he first discusses the revivals, usually in chronological order of their reappearance upon the stage, and then the new plays.

Within these chapters Mr. Kinne has given a useful and highly informative guide to the comedies which he found to be indebted, in great or small degree, to the French theatre. For each play he states the principal sources, and for the more important or more popular ones he analyzes the differences in plot or structure between the French source and the English version. These detailed comparisons are among the most useful portions of the book. For each play Mr. Kinne also gives an account of its popularity upon the stage during the decade in which it was first revived or performed, a list of the theatrical seasons in which it was later offered in London, and a bibliography of editions. Occasionally he discusses the critical or popular reception of the new or revived play. Nevertheless, although Mr. Kinne offers a considerable body of detailed information and interesting interpretation bearing upon French influences upon English comedy, one wishes that the five pages of Chapter VII ("Conclusion") had been extended to provide a more comprehensive analysis of the meaning of the facts presented in the earlier chapters. In addition, since the study is in part a reference guide to the sources and popularity of individual plays, an index to the pieces by title (there is one for names of persons only) would have facilitated greatly the reader's finding the discussion of a specific play.

In only one phase of his discussion, however, does Mr. Kinne appear to be inaccurate; his accounts of the stage popularity of some of the plays have been compiled from sources which are incomplete and from these data he has drawn an occasional conclusion which is not valid. From Chapter II (1749-1760) a few examples may be drawn. For *The Busy Body* (p. 18) he lists thirty-seven performances in London during 1749-1760; the playbills in the Huntington Library indicate that there were thirty-four per-

formances of it in Drury Lane and thirteen in Covent Garden, a total of forty-seven. For *The Mock Doctor* (p. 20) he lists twenty-nine performances in Drury Lane but overlooks twenty-five in Covent Garden. For *The Miser* (p. 37) he records forty-four performances, but there seem to have been fifty. Thus, his statement (p. 37) that *The Miser* ranks first and *The Mock Doctor* third among the nine adaptations from Molière during the decade reverses the relative popularity of the two pieces. In Chapter III (1760-1770) his account of *The Country Girl* similarly understates its frequency of performance. Whereas he has counted in *The Gentleman's Magazine* sixty-nine offerings of the comedy from 1785 to 1800 (p. 71) the theatrical advertisements in the newspapers and playbills in the British Museum announce eighty-nine performances. In discussing the acting in this play he overstates a point, for he says (p. 70) that from 1785 to 1800 *The Country Girl* was the "exclusive property" of King (acting Moody) and Mrs. Jordan (acting Peggy), he overlooks the fact that Bensley, Wroughton, Swendall, and Dowton occasionally acted Moody in that period and that on a few evenings Mrs. Wilson and Miss Molina acted Peggy when Mrs. Jordan was absent from the company. He is right, however, in attributing the success of the comedy to the skill of Mrs. Jordan's acting. From a later chapter (v: 1780-1790) may be taken a last example. For *Barnaby Rattle* (p. 162) he lists the following performances: 1782, five; 1785, two; 1786, one; etc. A more complete count reveals the following number: 1782, fourteen; 1783, eight; 1784, six; 1785, five. Although Mr. Kinne similarly understates the number of performances of some other plays, the stage popularity of the comedies is not his major concern and otherwise the work seems free from errors.

EMMETT L. AVERY

State College of Washington

A Map of Old English Monasteries and related ecclesiastical Foundations: A. D. 400-1066. By ALICE M. RYAN. (Cornell Studies in English XXVIII). Ithaca N. Y: Cornell University Press, 1939. Pp. vi + [36], with black-and-white map in pocket inside front cover. \$1.00.

In constructing a clear and nicely executed map showing the location of monasteries and other ecclesiastical sites of pre-Norman England Dr. Ryan has performed a good service for students of English cultural history. This map supplements significantly the Ordnance Survey map of *Britain in the Dark Ages* (A. D. 410-871) and is a welcome addition to the distinguished series in which it

appears—the first Cornell study connected in any substantial way with medieval England.

The map is supported by an index (pp. 9-28) of the 325 odd sites marked on the map and by a combined bibliography and key to abbreviations (pp. 29-33). Nearly one hundred of the items are crosses (reflecting former graveyards and churches?). The Celtic areas of Britain, except Cornwall with its strikingly dense concentration of religious houses, in the main await future treatment (cp. p. 6 bottom). Under the main entry of many of the names a considerable bibliography has been collected with useful references to Dugdale, the Victoria County History, charters, Domesday Book and other primary and secondary works.

The one real out about the work seems to me to be essentially in the spellings chosen for the map and as the main entry in the index. These are Old English though, as in the Ordnance Survey maps of *Roman Britain* and of *Britain in the Dark Ages* (quaint title!), the modern forms where known are included in the index-alphabet with cross-references to the OE key-form (map-form). As in the Ordnance Survey maps the principle adopted is essentially to cite the oldest recorded form: here Bede's Latin text looms large, then charters, the OE Annals etc. in a chronologically ascending scale. In practice this system works out very irregularly and yields a spotty, motley effect. Where, for instance, nom. and oblique cases by the luck of the draw jostle shoulders, we get such disparities as *Bancornaburg*, *Cungresbyri*, *Heanbyrg* (St), *Sceaftebyrig*; all should, of course, be reduced to *-burh*. *Couæntree* (map), *Couæntre* (index) is a poor form to choose vs. the available *Cofantreo*. Similar inconsistencies might be multiplied considerably and should in a new edition be eliminated by a reduction to a West-Saxon norm. But the names on the map itself should certainly be in modern English; for, after all, map and book is going to be of most use to historians of art, archaeology and church history, most of whom have little knowledge of and less interest in OE *per se*.

Trivia follow. County identification, please, even for the sites of crosses! Not *Adbaruae* and, but *ad Baruae*; so similar syntactical combinations. "Bangor Isycoed" is the official, Bartholomew name for *Bancornaburg*. *Beadnqaham* is wrongly alphabetized. Yorkshire names should specify the Ridings; so, e.g. *Crec* YN, not just plain Y, this distinction is conventional even in non-philological life. "Crowland" is, I think, preferable to "Croyland". Scottish names, where Celtic, should include where pertinent a reference to W. J. Watson, *The History of the Celtic Place-Names of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1926), e.g. under Dull. *Elmete*, an old district in YW, whose name is preserved in Elmet Hall near Leeds, is not identified. *Enli*, l. 2. read "-mitage." *Herutford*: Bede *HE*. *Hin* is inadequately located; see Bartholomew

under "Iona." Not Lewesham but Lewisham, which is, by the way, now in the co. of London, though formerly in Kent. *Maitros* (i. e. Melrose, Roxburghshire) of the map seems to be missing in the index. *Myresig* is in Ess not Ex! *Theodford* is surely Thetford (Nf), not Tetford (Li).

Once again: a good and useful work.

F. P. MAGOUN

Harvard University

The American Novel. By CARL VAN DOREN. New York: The Macmillan Co, 1940. Pp. viii + 406. \$2.25.

Hardy of Wessex: His Life and Literary Career. By CARL J. WEBER. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940. Pp. vii + 302. \$3.00.

Carl van Doren is the most eminent and indispensable historian of American fiction. The present book is an extension of his earlier work comprised in *The American Novel*, 1921, and *Contemporary American Novelists*, 1922, so as to include a view of novels which have appeared during the last twenty years. The present revision and enlargement is amply justified by the volume and quality of recent fiction. It is admirably proportioned and weighted, judicious and discriminating in critical estimates, comprehensive enough for all but extreme specialists, and written in a style of impeccable competence and suavity, conventional without banality and summary without shallowness. It has the merits as well as the limitations of an inclusive historical survey, conducted with scholarly thoroughness and without partiality. Justice is done to writers of all schools and genres, from Cooper or Melville to Howells, from Dreiser or Stephen Crane to Willa Cather, and lesser figures are placed in due perspective. If the leaders of the present moment are somewhat sketchily presented, it is obviously because Mr. van Doren does not choose to be carried away by what may prove to be the rash enthusiasm of a period. He never loses his head. A temper so unpartisan may not make for the most provocative of "creative" criticism, but it admirably serves the aims of critical history.

Professor Weber's *Hardy of Wessex* is a skilful selective summary of biographical data elsewhere accessible, greatly enriched with a large body of information of his own industrious gathering. He is particularly illuminating on what we might call technical matters—methods of composition, conditions of publication, early experiments, bibliographical oddities, sources of suggestion for characters and incidents (as in *Tess*), literary sources and influences, topography, time-charts for the action of the novels, etc. But

he makes excellent use of such information for the larger interpretation of Hardy's art and mentality. Highly interesting on the biographical side is his account of Hardy's first wife—paragon of vanity, silliness, and Victorian narrowness of mind—with whom the large-minded genius bore so patiently for so many years, and whom he mourned so almost inconsolably after her death. Mr. Weber is, I may add, too polite and charitable to characterize the lady in terms so blunt. His approach to Hardy is intelligently worshipful and understanding. He shows us a man honest, simple, and lovable, a thinker of grave and mournful seriousness with a sharp and unmitigable drive towards truth, modest inventor of tales for public consumption, skilful in fitting and joining, artist in whom a realism shocking to his contemporaries was dominated and harmonized by a tender humanism and a profound instinct for beauty. While *Hardy of Wessex* will not displace the official biography by Hardy's widow, it forms an invaluable supplement to it, and is a work indispensable to all devoted lovers and students of Hardy.

JOSEPH WARREN BEACH

University of Minnesota

Humanism and Imagination. By G R ELLIOTT. Chapel Hill.
The University of North Carolina Press, 1938. Pp. x + 253.
\$2 50.

In 1929 Professor Elliott published a volume of essays, *The Cycle of Modern Poetry*, which was characterized by acute thinking but was more difficult to read than the substance seemed to warrant. The present volume is still more difficult and less acute. The book is made up of essays and reviews originally written for periodicals; and part of the reader's trouble arises from the fact that the pieces do not fit together into a whole, although they are arranged in chapters to look like a connected treatment of an interesting subject. Two of the essays (or chapters) are valuable—those entitled "Irving Babbitt as I Knew Him" and "Stuart Sheiman and the War Age." Professor Elliott's picture of Babbitt is arresting, and is a truly and finely drawn portrait (with a considerable amount of G. R. E. thrown in, here and throughout the book). It is the more worth having because Babbitt notoriously failed to embody himself fully in his own books. With all his failures and limitations, he was one of the most remarkable Americans of the last generation; and as a university teacher he had the unusual qualification of being at once stimulating and solid. The reminiscences of his friends, therefore, are a service, not so much to his memory, as to those who had not the good fortune to know him personally. And amongst

such reminiscences, of which a number have been published and more are in prospect, Professor Elliott's take an important place.

Professor Elliott's essay on Sherman is a sound piece of criticism. Sherman was a writer of brilliant promise who fizzled out. Professor Elliott explains the mystery, and shows a talent for discreditation which one wishes he could exercise more consistently. For the remainder of this book falls a good deal below the level of the pages on Sherman and Babbitt. There is an essay on "Paul E. More and the Gentle Reader" which is, compared with the essay on Babbitt, an opportunity missed. Here and throughout the remainder of the book the prime difficulty is that Professor Elliott has several unharmonized aims. He wants to draw a portrait of More, but he also wants to lower More as a means of raising Babbitt (and himself); he wants to exhibit his own brand of Catholicism as something superior to the faiths of both More and Babbitt; he wants to present the "spirit of poetry" as a continuing stream of revealed truth, he wants to show that he is a professor with the rest of them and something better. He is able to mingle without uniting these aims because his own beliefs are deliberately vague. But a tenacious refusal to clear one's mind is not a serviceable step towards a successful book, and the "imagination" in the above title serves mainly to suggest the question what Professor Elliott imagined readers would be able to make of his muddled ruminations and reflections.

ROBERT SHAFER

University of Cincinnati

The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence. Edited by W. S. LEWIS. Volumes III-VIII: *Horace Walpole's Correspondence with Madame du Deffand and Wiert.* Edited by W. S. LEWIS AND WARREN HUNTING SMITH. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939. Pp. lxxxviii + 407, 497, 439, 502, 461, ix + 561. \$45.00.

The Yale Edition of Walpole's Correspondence, initiated three years ago by two volumes containing the correspondence with William Cole, is now augmented by six handsome volumes devoted to Madame du Deffand. This correspondence, extending from 1766 to 1780, has survived only in a very one-sided form. Out of about 1700 letters which must have been written only 955 now exist in whole or in part. Of the surviving letters 840 are from Madame du Deffand. Nearly all of Walpole's letters have perished—some were destroyed by Madame du Deffand, and others which she had returned to him were destroyed, probably at his direction, by his

protégée, Mary Berry, after his death. Six of his letters have been preserved in their original form, twelve exist in copies made by agents of the French Secret Service. Fragments of some 87 others survive, chiefly as quotations in the footnotes to Miss Berry's 1810 edition of *Madame du Deffand*. At least 700 letters have perished completely. The originals of all but a dozen of the letters of the blind French lady are preserved in the Bodleian.

This voluminous correspondence, which exhibits a lively and entertaining picture of Parisian society in the last decades of the *ancien régime*, reveals with decorous reserve the mind and personality of the writer, and mirror-fashion reflects one of the many aspects of Walpole's own character, was very competently edited in three stout octavo volumes by Mrs. Paget Toynbee in 1912. To the correspondence as there printed the Yale Edition has been able to add one long hitherto unpublished letter of Madame du Deffand, three hitherto unpublished letters from Walpole; three short paragraphs, a dozen sentences, and a few phrases or clauses which for some reason or other Mrs. Toynbee had silently omitted, and a few fragments of letters from Walpole quoted by Madame du Deffand in letters to other correspondents. The sum total of the additions to the correspondence amounts to less than fifteen pages. Other new significant material, however, is found in the journals which Walpole kept during his various visits to Paris (160 pages), and in Madame du Deffand's journal of the last year of her life (40 pages). These Paris journals of Walpole, of which only a few excerpts have hitherto been printed, give a detailed itinerary, stage by stage, of each of his journeys between London and Paris and record all his social engagements—the plays and operas he attended, where he dined and supped and in what company—during each of his five visits to the French capital.

The foot-note annotations are a model of what such a commentary should be. Walpole's own marginal notations on the originals and the notes of Miss Berry and Mrs. Toynbee are retained with indication of their source, together with much valuable material supplied by the present editors. The reader finds that all his reasonable queries are adequately but concisely answered, without any superfluous display of erudition. There is an amazingly full and minutely analyzed index of names and topics in a convenient single alphabet which fills no less than 343 closely printed pages.

In a review for *MLN* of the Yale volumes of the Yale Walpole the present reviewer expressed a regret that the editors had silently normalized and modernized the spelling, punctuation and capitalization of the originals. In the case of Madame du Deffand's letters there is, perhaps, a greater measure of justification for this procedure since, with very few exceptions, the originals are in the hand of an amanuensis, usually M. Wiert, rather than in that of the blind lady herself. But readers who are at home in the French

of the eighteenth century may be disturbed rather than pleased to find such modern spellings as *voulais* for the older *vouloirs*.

Mr. Lewis, his collaborating editor Mr. Warren Hunting Smith, and the authorities of the Yale University Press are again to be congratulated at this latest step forward in the great undertaking of the Yale Walpole

ROBERT K. ROOT

Princeton University

From Donne to Dryden The Revolt Against Metaphysical Poetry.

By ROBERT LATHROP SHARP. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1940 Pp. xiv + 221. \$3 00.

Sharp is responsible for a useful book. I should hesitate to say that he has *written* a useful book, for the best things in it are loan exhibits: by virtue, it is an anthology of passages from metaphysicals and neoclassicists, a portable repertory of what the metaphysicals thought of themselves and what the neoclassicists thought of them. As Sharp points out, the adherents to the "Donne tradition" attempted no reasoned defense of their poetics, a silence which invites, without receiving, explanatory speculation, but, besides Carew's elegy on Donne, properly treated by Williamson as the closest equivalent to such an "apology," there are many brief self-characterizations to be collected, as Sharp has (for the first time) collected them, and there are what may be called party terms and party phrases which Sharp is the first to have set in relief: "strong lines," "masculine style," and "metaphysical" (a word used by the "conceited" poets in a not purely literary, but in a literarily significant, sense) Almost equally useful, to the historian of poetry, is the much longer assemblage of neoclassical pronouncements upon the characteristic features of the metaphysical style as pejoratively named: its *extravagance*, *harshness*, and *obscurity*. From both groups, citations are drawn from relatively unfrequented sources,—especially the laudatory verses prefaced to volumes of poetry.

Here wholehearted praise must end. The intention is to be critical as well as historical; and the author shows a commendable acquaintance with Empson, Eliot, and the like. But—though this is nowhere clearly announced—his study of the transition is chiefly an historical study of the "critical" transition, not a critical study of the poetic transition: the book is not, that is, a superiorly informed equivalent of Gosse's *From Shakespeare to Pope*, and includes no equivalent of such metrical and rhetorical studies as Miss Wallerstein's and Mr. Williamson's. Nor are there any new ideas in explanation of its thesis. the revolt to be explained

"by reference to both literary and nonliterary forces" is accounted for in terms by now familiar to scholars: the rise of natural science and the Royal Society, the rise of Puritanism, the rise of Hobbes and Locke. What we are offered is a restatement of Richard Jones, William Haller, Basil Willey.

As a critic, Sharp seems confused. His own sympathies and even principles oscillate curiously, so that one does not know, except by counting the pro-metaphysical and pro-neoclassical passages, where the author stands. He takes neither a purely historical and determinist position, nor a consistently partisan position, nor some position which is independent of the issues as set. Predominantly influenced by Eliot, he can refer seriously to A. E. Housman's opposite theory of poetry as though one were reconcilable with the other. From first to last he uses critical and philosophical terms with a suspicious nonchalance: talks about poetic "sincerity" without analyzing that most precarious of concepts, talks about the religious poets' "neglect of reality" as though something like the central issue weren't, precisely, "What is reality?", alleges that the "partiality of the metaphysicals for abstractions . . . became displeasing to a scientific age," as though Science were not the Queen of Abstractionism. He does the strangest things to words like *abstract*, *general*, and *particular*. The book, in short, is an historically useful anthology accompanied by matter either familiar or immaturely construed.

AUSTIN WARREN

University of Iowa

Charles Reade, Sa Vie, Ses Romans. By LÉONE RIVES. Toulouse: Imprimerie Toulousaine, 1940. Pp. 528.

It's Never Too Late to Mend, an edition of Charles Reade's unpublished drama, with an introduction and notes. By LÉONE RIVES. Toulouse: Imprimerie Toulousaine, 1940. Pp. 111.

The present large French volume, dedicated to Paul Dottin, treats systematically both Reade's life and his novels and presents much new material. "We have endeavored," Dr. Rives declares in the preface, "to be the comprehensive biographer needed by a man like Reade. To bring out his characteristics, we have used, almost wholly, his intimate papers, his unpublished letters, and finally the enormous mass of his note-books, the reading of which proves fruitful."

The first part of the volume is devoted to Reade's life and throws new light on many of his aspects. The discussion, for instance, of the Puritanical character of the novelist's mother is illuminating. Again, the writer holds that Reade's relationship to Mrs. Sevmour,

whom he loved but whom he was kept from marrying by the terms of his Oxford fellowship, was not merely the Platonic one which it is usually considered. Her contribution to his literary work, Dr. Rives believes, consisted not, as is sometimes supposed, in actual suggestions, but in the warm sympathy and encouragement needed by a man of his nature. Finally, new light is thrown on the youthful love affair which took place in Scotland and which the fellowship again prevented from ripening into marriage. From it was born in 1848 a child,—the Charles Liston who was the novelist's legatee and who, on his father's death, assumed the name of Reade.

The second part of the book concerns Reade's novels, and discusses, in succession, their technique, their social views, their treatment of history, and their psychology. Dr. Rives points out that the publication of the principal humanitarian novels brought about, usually within a few years, laws ameliorating the abuses. There is, moreover, an interesting discussion of certain similarities between Reade and Zola and likewise an able account of psychology in Reade's novels.

The chief fault noticeable in this volume is an occasional carelessness in names. Thus we see mention of *Uncle Toms's Cabin* and "Ketty Sorel" instead of "Hetty Sorrel" (in *Adam Bede*). The present reviewer, moreover, finds himself in the bibliography with his middle name as surname but easily pardons such mistakes when he reflects how many opportunities for error exist in 528 pages.

The edition of *It's Never Too Late to Mend*, the drama which Reade drew from his novel of the same name, is welcome, since few of his plays are extant and since, indeed, Dr. Rives was able, after careful research, to find only a single copy of this one. The work is composed of one act of humanitarianism and three acts of old-fashioned melodrama.

Both volumes, then, are a contribution to our knowledge of Reade. They give us many new facts and provide a well-balanced idea of his significance in literature.

ALBERT MORTON TURNER

The University of Maine

Windows of the Morning, a critical study of William Blake's "Poetical Sketches," 1783. By MARGARET RUTH LOWERY.
New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940. Pp. xii + 249.
\$3.00. (Yale Studies in English, 93.)

This study of Blake's *Poetical Sketches* falls roughly into two sections: the circumstances of their publication and the literary influences to which they were subject. The first section, which to me is the more interesting of the two, leads off with a just and

careful analysis of the five basic biographies of Blake. This is a chapter which must be read by anyone who presumes to write or even to lecture in a scholarly way upon Blake's early life. The second chapter contributes something new to Blake's biography in its study of the relation of Blake and Flaxman. It is argued that Flaxman, rather than the Rev. Mr. Mathew or Mrs. Mathew, sponsored the *Poetical Sketches*, and it is suggested that he also wrote the somewhat deprecatory Preface. All this is plausible, perhaps even likely, but it is not proved, and ought not to be mentioned (p. 48) as a fact. It is further suggested, on the basis of a hitherto unpublished note of Blake's sending Flaxman a draft for £100, that in consequence of a quarrel Blake at this time (c. 1806) returned to Flaxman the expenses of printing the *Poetical Sketches*. Miss Lowery is concerned, though not as much as I am, by the fact that £100 is too large a sum for the expense in question, and she conjectures that Flaxman may have borne the expense of Robert Blake's last illness. There is too much conjecture here to lend any weight to the theory of Flaxman's sponsorship of the *Sketches*.

The second section of the study is devoted to literary influences. This is nearly always an uncertain subject, and the uncertainty is increased in this instance by the slightness of the *Poetical Sketches* both in scope and depth, and by the fact that what Blake assimilated from his reading was on the whole the spirit rather than the letter. Of the older influences—the Bible, Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton—I should be willing to accept Miss Lowery's account. I must point out, however, the omission of Ezra, whom Blake himself mentions as one of his early teachers. I suppose that in making this assertion Blake included, and perhaps had solely in mind, the apocryphal Ezra; yet Miss Lowery passes by the entire Apocrypha with the statement that Blake may have read it. In the analysis of eighteenth century influences I am less in agreement with Miss Lowery's findings. The twenty pages devoted to Thomson's influence leave me unconvinced at every point. It is true that Thomson defined the poet's function in very Blakean terms, but Blake could have arrived at this position without Thomson. And so it is with other and to me less striking parallels. In her discussion of Chatterton, however, Miss Lowery is on safe ground. The influence is clearly there, yet it has been denied for chronological reasons. But Miss Lowery shows that many of Chatterton's poems were published in periodicals in the very decade in which the *Sketches* were being composed. The study ends with an estimate of their literary value.

M. O. PERCIVAL

Ohio State University

The First Gentlemen of Virginia By LOUIS B. WRIGHT. San Marino, California. The Huntington Library, 1940 Pp. 373. \$3.75.

Much has been written about the "first gentlemen of Virginia," most of it by their descendants to prove the gentility and antiquity of their lineage, and the rest largely by New Englanders to prove the fallacy of the arguments advanced by the descendants. Dr. Wright concerns himself as little with the one group as with the other, and undertakes to assess the intellectual qualities of the dominant Virginia families during the first century and a quarter after the establishment of the colony. He finds that they sought their models in Elizabethan England, and that their fundamental ideals came from a remoter past. He points out that "fortitude, temperance, prudence, and justice were the four cardinal qualities that Aristotle and succeeding classical writers laid down as fundamental to the gentleman. The Renaissance accepted these entire, and added liberality and courtesy" Elizabethan and Jacobean writers expounded their conceptions of proper conduct in "courtesy" books, which the Virginians put into their libraries and into their pattern of thought. To the virtues named above, they added a sense of public responsibility which was one of their out-standing characteristics.

Dr. Wright thinks that their conceptions of conduct were more Aristotelian than Christian; but when has the Western World ever accepted the Christian doctrines of humility and non-resistance? Nevertheless, the seventeenth century Virginian was a decidedly religious man. Books on religious subjects had a prominent place in the libraries of the gentry and in some cases they actually outnumbered those on medicine and law. One could make out an extensive list of "blue laws" from the statutes of the House of Burgesses, but the Virginian loved his horses and his punch; he sometimes even loved his women more than he regarded the clergy of the Established Church. The Anglican was really no less religious than the Puritan, he was merely religious in a different way. If the former tolerated sins of the flesh, the latter tolerated and even admired sins of the money bags.

It is from a careful study of early libraries that Dr. Wright has derived most of his information concerning the intellectual bent of the early Virginians. His conclusion is that, though they undertook to follow English models, they did not undertake to keep abreast of the times, usually neglecting Shakespeare and Milton, for instance, and emphasizing the "classics" of an earlier period. As a result, he believes that they were more like the Englishmen of Elizabeth's time than like the contemporary Britisher who had meanwhile developed the negative virtues of the "public school."

By previous research and writing, Dr. Wright is well qualified for the subject which he undertook. He handles it in a scholarly and dispassionate manner, and his findings in the field of antique gentility should be amusing to this generation of progressively mechanized vulgarity.

THOMAS PERKINS ABERNETHY

The University of Virginia

Philosophy in the Poetry of Edwin Arlington Robinson. By ESTELLE KAPLAN. New York. Columbia University Press, 1940.

Miss Kaplan's book on the philosophy of Edwin Arlington Robinson opens with the presentation of certain clues to his thought to be found in his letters. After quoting various critical comments on his poetry which, though "not very well informed and not detailed," at least "suggest the need for a critical examination of Robinson's philosophical ideas," she discusses the influence upon his thinking of "Schopenhauer, filtering through Royce and distilled further in the alembic of Hardy's world." She points out that he was neither pessimist nor materialist, but that he found peace in the light that enabled him to discern the darkness, a "fearlessness in the face of the revelations of self-knowledge and of dark omnipotence." Miss Kaplan distinguishes four stages in Robinson's intellectual growth, marked by four chief themes in his poetry: the tragedy of light, the tragedy of love in conflict with duty, the tragedy of marriage, and the tragedy of power. In the second and longer part of the book, she analyzes poems representative of these four groups, with final emphasis on *King Jasper*, "a synthesis of all the periods."

Miss Kaplan has cleared Robinson of the ill-founded charge of unrelieved pessimism. She has defined more closely than her predecessors his connections with New England transcendentalism and the influence upon his thinking of Royce's interpretation of Schopenhauer. And her analysis of the poems should be helpful to those who find Robinson's symbolism difficult.

Greater clarity and ease, however, in organization and in style would be desirable in a book of this kind. The two opening chapters, appearing at first to be merely a series of quotations, must be reread in the light of what follows before they take on their real significance. Miss Kaplan's sentences, often awkward, are not always clear in construction ("Even as success has nothing to do with honor, so with intelligence"); and sometimes her paraphrases of Robinson's verse are less illuminating than the poet's imagery. Also she is more successful in analyzing philosophical thought than human emotion. She does not always penetrate to the feelings and

motives of the characters or recognize and appreciate a dramatic situation. Consequently her use of quotations to prove her point is occasionally misleading. She forgets, for example, that Matthias was slightly drunk when he said,

Where are the mysteries in us that require
So much dramatic fuss?

Such failures in insight or errors in interpretation do not invalidate Miss Kaplan's main thesis. Her book, after all, is not literary criticism but philosophical analysis. But in presenting Robinson the thinker, it is a pity to represent incorrectly or inadequately Robinson the poet.

Goucher College

ELIZABETH NITCHIE

BRIEF MENTION

The Art of Satire By DAVID WORCESTER. Cambridge Harvard University Press, 1940. Pp. x + 194. \$1.75. This is an entertaining and often brilliantly written little volume. The author's object is to classify the various literary incarnations of the "volatile and Protean spirit" of satire. He has written chapters on "Invective," "Burlesque," "Irony, the ally of Comedy," "Irony, the ally of Tragedy," and "The evolution of English satire." These form the main divisions of his subject, but within each of the chapters he multiplies distinctions, so that he discovers, for example, nine sorts of burlesque. Seldom, however, are his distinctions forced or arid. He has made them in order to examine in detail the rhetorical principles governing each type of satire. In this task Mr. Worcester has been very successful. In a trenchant phrase he often clears the ground of much debris of familiar and futile argument. "When we dislike irony," he writes, "we call it sarcasm." That disposes of a tortured subject of discussion once and for all.

Inevitably a person who strives to make his language constantly simple and striking is occasionally inept. Some of Mr. Worcester's carefully wrought antitheses are merely verbal. "What we are faced with in high burlesque," he writes, "is a simile in reverse, a simile without a similitude." Only occasionally does he fall into strained cleverness and bad taste, as when he says "Irony is the shoe horn of ideas" or "The labor of analyzing each stage in the growth of irony would be about as profitable as milking a he goat into a sieve."

Sometimes Mr. Worcester's desire to find an effective example of the kind of satire he is discussing at the moment leads him to perverse literary judgments. Such is the opinion expressed in the following sentence. "Perhaps the finest use of sustained irony (in American letters) occurs in Mark Twain's *The Mysterious*

Stranger." Only Professional naturalists like Theodore Dreiser would share this opinion. In most of this work Clemens completely loses his psychic distance and merely expresses painful personal unhappiness. The doctrines he then announces are crass forms of pessimistic materialism crudely expressed.

However, blemishes of this sort are infrequent. Seldom does Mr. Worcester substitute empty cleverness for criticism. And very often he goes far beyond mere analysis of rhetorical means and manners to reveal sound critical insight. His explanation of the way in which the irony of the Greeks fed the "grand tradition of satire in the western world" is an uncommonly able piece of historical criticism. The book will profit and delight both the professional student of literature and the intelligent general reader.

Columbia University

OSCAR JAMES CAMPBELL

Traditions in American Literature. By JOSEPH MERSAND. New York: Modern Chapbooks Press, 1939. Pp. xiii + 247. \$2.00. The title of this book is less descriptive than the blurb on the jacket: "A study of Jewish characters and authors in American literature from colonial times to the present day, with copious bibliographies." Such a study has long been needed. This one, however, will be found valuable principally for the material the author has assembled. Mr. Mersand's difficulty seems to have been in deciding upon a definite point of view from which to survey the contribution of the Jew to American literature. Was he interested in evaluating the work of authors of Jewish extraction or the reflection of Jewish life in America as portrayed by both Jews and non-Jews? Perhaps the looseness of his structure is to some extent responsible for the effect of disunity and abortiveness. Certainly the proportions of the various parts indicate neither scholarly nor critical selection. George S. Kaufman, Elmer Rice, Clifford Odets, S. N. Behrman, Irwin Shaw, and Samuel and Bella Spewack, among the dramatists, receive separate chapters; only Robert Nathan and Ben Hecht, among novelists, are given chapters; and no Jewish poet is given separate treatment. None of the collaborators of Kaufman, not even Moss Hart or Marc Connelly, receives more than a cursory mention, and none of the popular Jewish novelists, such as Edna Ferber or Fannie Hurst, is discussed with any degree of comprehensiveness.

Many of Mr. Mersand's off-hand statements invite challenge. The fact that Wexley's plays "were produced in Russia as true representations of phases of American life" (p. 12) does not prove their excellence. Nor is the determination of the Spewacks "to try to improve their technique and broaden the scope of their activities" (p. 77) proof that they can ever attain the "stature

of S. N. Behrman or George S. Kaufman." And the fact that Arthur Guiterman "has published sixteen books of poetry since 1909" (p. 129) may be significant of something, but there still remains the question of the quality of his verse.

The Johns Hopkins University

N. BRYLLION FAGIN

Positivism in the United States (1853-1861). By RICHMOND LAURIN HAWKINS. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938. Pp. x + 243. \$3.00. (Harvard Studies in Romance Languages, Vol. 14.) Professor Hawkins published in 1936 a book entitled *Auguste Comte and the United States (1816-1853)*, and the above volume is a continuation. The record of his search for early traces of Comte in this country now runs to nearly 400 pages. In a footnote (p. 86) in the 1936 instalment he wrote. "At no time before the Civil War were there in the United States more than a half-dozen adults who accepted both the positive philosophy and the Religion of Humanity." In the book under review he writes: "The Protestant United States was poor soil for Comte's theories" (p. 26). Both books are models of scholarly method, and these conclusions are so thoroughly documented and proved that no one will ever be tempted to prove them over again. We might have guessed that the Protestant theologians and professors of philosophy who encountered Comte would have felt bound to oppose him, and now we know that they did. We also learn that the handful who accepted him before the Civil War were men of no great mark or significant influence. The letters printed do not appear to tell us anything about Comte that was not known before. We hear a good deal in the later volume about one of the odd Utopian communities of nineteenth-century America; but this one, unlike some of the others, was obscure while it lasted, and vanished without exerting any influence on the life, thought, or literature of the United States. All in all, Professor Hawkins has conclusively demonstrated that there is nothing in this field of study which should for a moment detain persons with no time to waste.

ROBERT SHAFER

University of Cincinnati

Peter Porcupine in America: The Career of William Cobbett, 1792-1800. By MARY ELIZABETH CLARK. Philadelphia: Privately printed, 1939. Pp. vi + 193. (University of Pennsylvania dissertation in English.) Miss Clark's aims are "to reconstruct Cobbett's life in Philadelphia in as great detail as possible" and to "show the connection of the writing he did here with the general course of historical events." In addition to Cobbett's works, the chief

source of information for most biographers of this period, Miss Clark has used such materials as the Rush papers at the Library Company of Philadelphia, some unpublished letters (notably a series written to James Mathieu from Wilmington in 1793-94, now at the Huntington Library), and the files of contemporary newspapers. Her contribution is avowedly factual, a considerable expansion of the usual accounts of Cobbett's most eventful stay in the United States, rather than a reinterpretation. It is probable, indeed, that such a biography as Mr G. D. H. Cole's relates Cobbett's writings more clearly to his time.

This book, nevertheless, will be valuable both to one who seeks to understand the development of Cobbett's political thought and to one who is concerned with the nature and details of the conflict between the Federalists and the Republicans. It indicates how Cobbett learned his trade and made his reputation in Philadelphia, and displays his importance to Americans because his violent pro-British sentiments helped to turn the new nation "away from the monarchical and aristocratic tradition toward Jeffersonian democracy." More problematical, perhaps, is the suggestion that Cobbett's later modifications of political belief "may have been in part a result of his American experience" Miss Clark's explanation of a central puzzle in Cobbett's career—his shift from anti-Jacobin to Radical—seems to be that he was influenced in some way by those principles which he most vigorously attacked. There are many hints here that his position was emotional rather than rational, that patriotism and personalities had a larger part in his life than principles. One may learn a good deal about party politics and men's motives from the experiences of William Cobbett.

The University of Texas

THEODORE HORNBERGER

CORRESPONDENCE

A "FALSIFIED VERSE" IN KLEIST'S *Homburg*? The November 1940 issue of this journal contained an interesting contribution by Walter Silz on a disputed reading of Kleist's *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*. Having established the line referred to in Tieck's letter as *Homburg* 594, Mr Silz plausibly conjectures that it was pointed out to Tieck by one of Kleist's friends long after the poet's death, in fact long after the first appearance of *Homburg* in the *Nachgelassene Schriften*. Mr. Silz is under no illusions as to the dependability of Tieck as an editor, and he cites numerous instances of Tieck's tampering with Kleist's text. Yet he is inclined to side with Tieck in this instance and accept the claim that Kleist wrote "Spanien" when he meant "Frankreich" or that he substituted Spain for France in his manuscript in order to avoid trouble with the censor. Mr. Silz argues

this point of view very ably. Nevertheless I am not convinced I still believe that Kleist wrote

Gedrängt von Spaniens Tyrannenheeren,

as the line stands in all texts save Tieck's text of 1846. The reasons for my conviction may be briefly summarized as follows

(1) Where political censorship prevails, putting a check on the free expression of political loves and hates, a poet will write, generally speaking, what he can hope to "get away with." It does not seem plausible that a poet—a Kleist, of all poets—should doctor his manuscript in advance to forestall a carping censor. Why, then, should Kleist have done so here?

(2) But even supposing that Kleist was persuaded to change the line in question in the manuscript that the printer was to use in setting up his type, this consideration did not hold good with regard to the manuscript that has come down to us. The extant manuscript was copied, at Kleist's direction, as a gift for a Prussian princess. As such it might be expected to contain Kleist's authentic text, not a version that had been tampered with to please the censor. Yet, as Mr. Silz notes, this manuscript also has the traditional line. Should this be due to an oversight?

(3) There was no reason to expect special vigilance on the censor's part with regard to Kleist's *Homburg*. Unlike the *Hermannsschlacht*, this play is in no way a transparently veiled portrayal of Prussia's struggle against Napoleon.

(4) Making allowance for the common belief that inordinately stupid people were appointed to the post of censor, it is hard to believe—though by no means impossible—that the passage in question should have been deemed offensive even in the phrasing

Gedrängt von den Tyrannenheeren Frankreichs

For here France is shown, at a time remote from the present, as engaged in a war not with Prussia, but with the Netherlands. Moreover, the reference to France occurs in an expository participial clause, at the beginning of a sentence, where it could not possibly have touched off an anti-French outburst of applause during a theatrical performance. Or was the censorship of so iron-clad a nature as to require that under no circumstances was the mention of French armies to be associated with the idea of tyranny?

(5) But let us see what Kleist got away with in his heavily censored *Berliner Abendblätter* on the score of the French. For the issue of October 20, 1810 Kleist revamped an anecdote about a dare-devil Prussian soldier who, taken prisoner after the Battle of Jena, manages to escape and subsequently kills and plunders a goodly number of the French. Recaptured finally and sentenced to be shot, he asks to have a last wish. This being granted, he takes down his trousers and asked to be shot in such a way as to prevent his hide from being punctured.¹ The printed source from which Kleist borrowed this story has the soldier captured by the Bavarians,

¹ *Werke* (B I¹.) IV, 190

Napoleon's "Rheinbund" allies Reinhold Steig, whose book contains both versions,² comments on Kleist's substitution as follows

Er kann auch die Rheinbunds-Baiern als die Feinde, gegen die er Hasz erwecken will, nicht brauchen. Er kennt nur einen Feind für alles Deutsche. Unbedenklich setzt er die Franzosen statt der Baiern ein.³

(6) While this anecdote disposes of the idea that Kleist obligingly cooperated with the censor in order to avoid giving offense to the French, I feel certain for other reasons that Spain is part of the authentic context and that Kleist did not substitute Spain for France in our moot passage as a cautious afterthought. The whole passage reads as follows

*Gedrängt von Spaniens Tyrannenheeren,
Weiß Moritz kaum, mein Vetter von Oranien,
Wo er die eignen Kinder retten soll*

Who can Moritz be but the well-known son of William the Silent, the successor to his father's policy of waging the fight against Spain? The name of Moritz calls to mind the heroic struggle of the Netherlands against their traditional foe, setting in motion a train of images of high emotional voltage for every German reader of Kleist's day, and the name of Moritz also serves to remind us that *our* play is not contemporaneous with the days of *Egmont* and *Don Carlos* but is laid in a later phase of the struggle. We have moved up in time from those epic days of William the Silent and the Duke of Alva! To this extent our time sense is invited to function despite the manifest interweaving of historical fact and legend in the tissue of the play. But how does Moritz, who died in 1625—fifty years before the battle of Fehrbellin—fit into the picture if we replace Spain by France? In the days of the Great Elector there was no Moritz. It was William the Third of Orange who directed the affairs of his country. Supposing, then, that Kleist was trying to be true to history, he would have written

*Gedrängt von den Tyrannenheeren Frankreichs
Weiß Wilhelm kaum, mein Vetter von Oranien,
Wo er die eignen Kinder retten soll*

Supposing further that the censor objected to the mention of France, Kleist would have replaced the first line by the one we read in our editions, but the name of Wilhelm would have stood!

(7) While this might suffice to clinch the authenticity of the standard version, let us look at one more aspect of the case. As we have seen, the net effect of reading France for Spain is to substitute one historical incongruity for another and to sacrifice in the bargain an historical myth, an emotional complex, rich in associations and sure of an automatic response,—in short, to exchange a "marble hall" of the imagination for a patched piece of scaffolding. Whether Kleist knew his historical facts well enough to do this grafting together of two historical epochs in full awareness I do not claim to know. We all know, however, that the his-

² Reinhold Steig, *Heinrich von Kleist's Berliner Kämpfe*, (Berlin und Stuttgart, 1901), 343-5

³ *Ibid.*, 344-5.

torian among German dramatists, Friedrich Schiller, played with his historic material in sovereign fashion when he presented the destruction of the Great Armada (1588) as coincident with the despatching of the Duke of Alba to the Netherlands (1567). And with the weighty precedent of his beloved *Don Carlos* before his eyes, Kleist would not have been the man to flinch from such a bold telescoping of historical events.

(8) If there is no valid reason for changing the line, how, then, did Tieck come to revise it in 1846?

I think that some admirer of Kleist's, some person well grounded in history but deficient in poetic imagination, discovered the historical inaccuracy of the passage and took exception to it. He was shocked to think that a great patriot should have erred so egregiously in sketching the background of that glorious epoch of Brandenburg's history. Reluctant to charge Kleist with an error that would have compromised a Prussian school-boy, he sought for an explanation. Having found one that seemed inherently plausible,—the stringency of censorship—he nursed it until it grew to the stature of subjective certainty. This achieved, he did his bit to save Kleist's good name by palming theory off as fact upon Kleist's grateful editor.

Yale University

HERMANN J. WEIGAND

ROUSSEAU AND FAUST. Shortly after the publication of my note on *Rousseau and Faust* (MLN, Dec. 1940), I received a courteous note from Professor Albert W. Aron, enclosing a reprint of his article "The Mature Goethe and Rousseau," (*Journal of English and German Philology*, April, 1936), in which he traces with full documentation Goethe's interest in Rousseau. At the end he points out the parallel between a passage in the *Rêveries* and the pact in *Faust*. This was the point of my note. I wish to offer to Prof. Aron apologies for my unwitting repetition of a part of his findings and thanks for his gracious attitude in the matter. While reading selections from Rousseau with a class, my eye fell on the passage in question. The resemblance to Goethe's lines struck me instantly, I examined such editions and studies of *Faust* as were available to me, found no allusion to the *Rêveries* and submitted my note. I would add that I am at once gratified to see my conjecture confirmed by Prof. Aron's researches and chagrined to learn that I have repeated a find of his. I was entirely unaware of his investigation until he sent me the reprint.

Reed College

BENJ. M. WOODBRIDGE

THE REVIEW OF ENGLISH STUDIES. We are glad to learn from Professor James R. Sutherland that *The Review of English Studies*, of which he is now the editor, has every intention of carrying on through the war. The *RES* needs and deserves the support of all who are interested in English scholarship.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received]

Bateson, F. W. (ed.).—The Cambridge bibliography of English literature vol I, 600-1660, II, 1660-1800, III, 1800-1900, IV, Index *New York* Macmillan, 1941 Pp xi + 912, xx + 1003, xxii + 1098, iv + 287 \$32 50

Browning, Robert.—Poetical works, complete from 1833 to 1868 and the shorter poems thereafter *London*. Humphrey Milford [*New York* Oxford U Press], [1941] Pp xiv + 698 \$1 75 (Oxford Editions of Standard Authors)

Commission on Teacher Education.—A brief statement of its origin and scope *Washington, D C* American Council on Education, 1940 Pp ii + 18

Day, Cyrus Lawrence and Murrie, Eleanore Boswell.—English song-books, 1651-1702, a bibliography, with a first-line index of songs *London* Oxford U Press, 1940 Pp xxii + 439 (Printed for the Bibliographical Society, and issued only to Members)

Deferrari, Harry A.—Outline of a theory of linguistic change *Washington, D C*. privately printed, 1941 Pp ii + 21

Donne, John.—Ignatius his Conclave, or his inthronisation in a late election in hell Reproduced in facsimile from the edition of 1611, with an introduction by Charles M Coffin *New York* Columbia U. Press, 1941 Pp xxxii + 148 \$1 60 (Facsimile Text Society, 53)

Hankins, John Erskine.—The life and works of George Turberville *Lawrence, Kansas* U of Kansas, 1940 Pp v + 98 \$1 00 (U of Kansas Pubs, Humanistic Studies, 25)

Heltzel, Virgil B. (ed.).—Types of English prose, non-fiction *New York* Macmillan, 1941 Pp xviii + 678 \$1 50 (Types of English Literature)

Herr, Alan Fager.—The Elizabethan sermon, a survey and a bibliography *Diss. Philadelphia*: U of Penn, 1940 Pp 169

Housman, Alfred Edward.—A bibliography Compiled by Theodore G. Ehrsam *Boston*: F W. Faxon, 1941. Pp 44. \$1 25 (Useful Reference Series, 66.)

Hoyt, Charles H.—Five plays. Edited by Douglas L. Hunt. *Princeton, N. J*: Princeton U. Press, 1941. Pp xvi + 240. \$5 00 (America's Lost Plays, ix.)

Hughes, Helen Sard.—The gentle Hertford, her life and letters. *New York*: Mac-

millan, 1940 Pp xiv + 506 (A Wellesley College Publication)

Manch, Joseph.—Jonathan Swift and women *Buffalo, N Y*: U of Buffalo, 1941 Pp 83 \$0 50 (U of Buffalo Studies, xvi, 4 Monographs in English, 3) [A creditable M A thesis which surveys in detail the part women play in Swift's life and writings]

Milton, John.—Complete poetical works Edited with introduction and notes by Harris Francis Fletcher *Boston* Houghton Mifflin, [1941] Pp. xiv + 574 \$2 80 (A revision of the Cambridge Edition, edited by William Vaughn Moody)

—Poems With introduction and notes by James Holly Hanford *New York* Thomas Nelson, 1941 Pp lxxxviii + 582 \$1 50 (Nelson's English Series)

Parker, William Riley.—Milton's contemporary reputation, an essay, together with a tentative list of printed allusions to Milton, 1641-1674, and facsimile reproductions of five contemporary pamphlets written in answer to Milton *Columbus, Ohio* Ohio State U Press, 1940 Pp xii + 299 (Grad School Studies, Contributions in Lang and Lit, 7)

Parks, Edd Winfield.—Charles Egbert Craddock (Mary Noailles Murfree) *Chapel Hill, North Carolina* U of N C Press, [1941] Pp xvi + 258 \$2 50

Plato.—On the trial and death of Socrates, *Euthyphro*, *Apology*, *Crito*, *Phaedo* Translated, with introduction and notes, by Lane Cooper *Ithaca, N Y*: Cornell U Press, 1941 Pp xiv + 200 \$2 00

Poe, Edgar Allan.—The great tales and poems Pocket Book Text Series *New York*: Pocket Books, Inc, 1940 Pp xiv + 360 \$0 33

—*Tamerlane* and other poems Reproduced in facsimile from the edition of 1827, with an introduction by Thomas Olive Mabbott *New York* Columbia U Press, 1941 Pp lxvi + 40 \$1 80 (Facsimile Text Society, 51)

Pope, Alexander.—Imitations of Horace, with An Epistle to Dr Arbuthnot and The Epilogue to the Satires Edited by John Butt. *London* Methuen, [1939] Pp liv + 406 16/6. (Twickenham Edition of Poems of Alexander Pope, iv)

—The Rape of the Lock, and other poems Edited by Geoffrey Tillotson *London*: Methuen, [1940] Pp xx + 410 16 sh (Same, ii.)

Rudman, Harry W.—Italian nationalism and English letters, figures of the Risorgimento and Victorian men of letters. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1940 Pp. 444 \$3.25 (Columbia U. Studies in Eng and Comp Lit, 146)

Shakespeare. — *Henry the Fourth, Part Two* A new variorum edition, ed Matthias A Shaaber *Philadelphia, Pa* · Lippincott, 1940 Pp xx + 715 \$7 50

Speare, M. E. (ed.) — *The Pocket Book of Verse, great English and American poems New York.* Pocket Books, Inc., 1940 Pp xxvi + 422 \$0 25

Stauffer, Donald A — *The art of biography in eighteenth century England, and Bibliographical supplement Princeton, N J* · Princeton U Press, 1941 Pp xiv + 572, x + 293 \$5 00 each, \$8 50 together

Sutherland, Arthur Bruce — *Maurice Hewlett historical romancer Diss Philadelphia U of Penn,* 1938 Pp x + 199

University of Toronto Quarterly. — Reprints Arthur Barker, "The pattern of Milton's *Nativity Ode*," and E K Brown, "Thomas Wolfe realist and symbolist." *Toronto: U of Toronto Quarterly*, x (Jan, 1941) Pp 167-81, 153-66

Williams, Margaret (transl and arr.) — *Word-Hoard, passages from Old English literature from the sixth to the eleventh centuries New York* Sheed and Ward, 1940 Pp. xvi + 459 \$4 00

Wolfe, Don M — *Milton in the Puritan Revolution New York* · Thomas Nelson, 1941. Pp xvi + 496 \$4 00

Wordsworth, William — *Poetical works, — poems written in youth, poems referring to the period of childhood Edited from the manuscripts, with textual and critical notes by E de Selincourt Oxford* · Clarendon Press [*New York Oxford U. Press*], 1940 Pp xvi + 379 \$6 00

Wynn, Dudley Taylor. — *A critical study of the writings of Mary Hunter Austin (1868-1934) Abridgement of diss. New York* · N. Y. U., 1941. Pp ii + 22.

GERMAN

Bansa, Elfriede. — *Bettina von Arnims Verhältnis zur Kunst Diss. Frankfurt Wurzberg: K. J. Tilsch,* 1938 70 pp

Behne, Hermann. — *Wilhelm Waiblinger Eine neue Würdigung seines Lebens und Schaffens Berlin: Behr's Verlag,* 1939. 243 pp, 3 plates M. 5 00.

Bohnenblust, Gottfried. — *Carl Spitteler. [Aus: Grosse Schweizer. 1938]. Zurich: Atlantis Verl [1938].* 9 pp.

— *Conrad Ferdinand Meyer [Aus: Grosse Schweizer 1938]. Zurich: Atlantis Verl. [1938].* 8 pp.

— *Die Dichtung der Eidgenossenschaft [Aus: Die Schweiz—Mein Land. 1939]. Olten: Walter [1939].* 8 pp. 4°.

Debrunner, A. — *Aus der Krankheitsgeschichte des Genitivs Vortrag, gehalten im*

"Verein für deutsche Sprache" in Bern am 10 Nov 1939 [Aus: *Beiner Schulblatt* 1939/40, Nr 39-41] *Bern: Eicher & Roth [1939]* 29 pp

Dittrich, Marie-Luise — *Sechzehn lateinische Gedichte Willrams von Ebersberg Diss Göttingen, Teildruck [Aus: Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum Bd 76, H 1/2]. Berlin Weidmann, 1939* 19 pp

Feuchte, Herbert — *Theodor Storm und die Romantik Diss Hamburg* 1940 78 pp

Fifty Years of German Drama A Bibliography of Modern German Drama, 1880-1930, Based on the Loewenberg Collection in the Johns Hopkins University Library *Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1941* ix, 111 pp \$3 75

Goedeke — *Grundriss zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung N F (Fortführung von 1830 bis 1880) Im Auftrag d Preuss Akademie d Wiss hrsg von Georg Minde Pouet Lfg 1 Dresden.* Ehlermann, 1940 vi, 208 pp M 18 00

Goldschmidt, Hermann L — *Der Geist der Erziehung bei Jeremias Gotthelf Bern, Leipzig Haupt,* 1939 52 pp Fr 2

Grundmann, Karl — *Zur Entwicklung der Schilderung des Lanzenkampfes in der hofischen Epik Das Anrennen und die Haltung des Ritters Warschau* 1936 35 pp

Hahne, Franz — *Kleidersellerbuchlein Urkunden zum Leben des Braunschweigischen Kreises um Wilhelm Raabe Im Auftr der Raabe-Ges hrsg Wolfenbüttel.* Heckner, 1939 150 pp, 6 plates

Houben, Heinrich — *Der Henese-Fleck Das Kramerlatein der Breyeller Ein belehrendes und unterhaltendes Buchlein über eine alte Geheimsprache (Hrsg von Verkehrs- und Verschönerungsverein der Gemeinde Breyell) [Breyell Goertz, 1939]* 52 pp

Hermann, Eduard. — *Althochdeutsche Kleinigkeiten [Nachrichten von d Ges d Wiss zu Göttingen Philol-hist Kl Fachgr 4, N F Bd 3, Nr 3]. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1940.* 37-51 pp M 1

Kaprolat, Richard. — *Chr D Grabbes Drama "Napoleon oder die hundert Tage" Eine Interpretation. Diss Munster Lengerich, Westf* · Lengericher Handelsdruckerei, 1939 129 pp

Koppelman, H. L. — *Ursachen des Lautwandels. Leiden: Siythoff, 1939* 156 pp. Fl. 4.50.

Koppensteiner, R. — *Wortschatz für den Sippenforscher. Altes und fremdes Sprachgut aus alten Matrikeln und Urkunden. Wien: Paul Kaltschmid [1939]* 78 pp. M. 3.

Kossat, Ernst. — *Wesen und Aufbauformen der Lyrik Georg Trakls. [Dichtung, Wort und Sprache. H. 3] Diss. Hamburg: Hansischer Gildenverlag, 1939* 102 pp M. 3 60.

- Krahk, Dietrich von**—Die geschichtlichen Züge der deutschen Heldendichtung [Aus Akademie d Wiss in Wien, Almanach. Jg 89 1939] *Wien*. Staatsdruckerei, 1939 23 pp M 1 20
- Kraus, Carl von**—Des Minnesangs Frühling Nach Karl Lachmann, Moriz Haupt und Friedrich Vogt neu bearbeitet *Leipzig*. Hirzel, 1940 xviii, 541 pp M 10
- Zum "Saelden Hort" und zu Seifrits "Alexander" [Sitzungsberichte d Bayer Akad d Wiss Philos-hist Abt Jg 1940, H 1] *München*. C H Beck, 1940 22 pp M 1 40
- Mann, Thomas**—Selected Essays, Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary by Uland E Fehlau and Charles W Rechenbach *New York* F S Crofts & Co, 1941 xvi, 186 pp \$1 40
- Meulen, R. van der**—Over het woord sabel [Mededeelingen d Koninklijke Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen Afd Letterkunde N R Deel 3, No 5] *Amsterdam*. N V Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Mij [1940] 44 pp Fl 80
- Meyer, Anton Hans**—Die "Himmel-Schlüssel" des Hans Assmann von Abschatz Formanalyse, zugleich ein Beitrag zum Problem der "Wechselseitigen Eihellung der Kunste" Diss Munster *Bochum-Langendreer* Poppinghaus, 1939 viii, 37 pp.
- Misteli, Paul**—Das "Denkmahl" in der deutschschweizerischen Literatur des 18 Jahrhunderts Diss Zurich *Affoltern am Albis* Weiss, 1939 123 pp
- Muller, Herbert**—Die Variation in der altgermanischen, alt- und mittelhochdeutschen Dichtung Eine stilgeschichtliche Untersuchung Diss Leipzig *Wurzburg-Aumühle*: K Triltsch, 1939 xii, 339 pp
- Nolte, Fred O.**—Lessing's *Laokoon* *Lancaster, Pa*. Lancaster Press, 1940 175 pp. \$2 00
- Panzer, Friedrich**—Gahmuret Quellenstudien zu Wolframs Parzifal [Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie d Wiss. Philos-hist Kl Jg 1939/40, Abh 1] *Heidelberg*. Carl Winter, 1940 80 pp M 4
- Pauquet, Peter Paul**—Schöpferische Angst Versuch einer Angst-Kosmologie bei Reiner Maria Rilke. Diss Bonn Teildruck *Oberpleis*: 1939 109 pp
- Rody, Georg M**—Die Merseburger Zaubersprüche Privatdruck, 300 num Ex *Burkesdorf-Duren*. Ragier, 1940. 12 pp, 1 facsimile. 4°.
- Roukens, Win.**—Wort- und Sachgeographie Sudost-Niederlands und der umliegenden Gebiete Mit bes. Berücksichtigung des Volkskundlichen. T. 1A 1B. *Nymegen*: Uitgevers
- Mij "De Gelderlander," 1937 xi, 487 pp, 8°, Atlas, 7, 90, 10 plates, 4° Fl. 18.
- Rudiger, Hans Helmut**—Liederreda und germanische Seele Diss Leipzig [Germanische Studien. H. 215]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1939 243 pp. M 9 60
- Runge, F. F.**—Das Gift in der deutschen Sprache H 1 Oranienburg 1857 Neudruck *Oranienburg* Torner, 1938 31 pp 45 Pf
- Ryssel, Fritz Heinrich**—Friedrich Gottlob Wetzel innerhalb der geistigen und politischen Erneuerung Deutschlands im Zeitalter der Romantik Diss Frankfurt *Darmstadt*. Wittich, 1939 110 pp
- Schmidt, Peter Heinrich**—Goethe als Geograph [Veröffentlichungen d Handels-Hochschule St Gallen Reihe B, H 4]. *St Gallen*: Fehr, 1939 48 pp Fr 2 25
- Schulte Strathaus, Ernst**—Goethes Faust-Fragment Eine buchkundliche Untersuchung [Schriften der Corona 26] *München* Oldenbourg, *Zurich* Verl der Corona, 1940 32 pp, 6 leaves M 4 50
- Steiner, Emil**—Geschichtlicher und geographischer Abriss der schweizerdeutschen Mundart Mit Sprachkarte der Schweiz *Basel*. Wepf & Co, 1937 64 pp Fr 7
- Prinzipien der deutschen Sprachwissenschaft *Basel*. Wepf & Co, 1937. 246 pp Fr 9
- Stenkuhl, Wilhelmine**—Die Holderlinsche Mitte Interpretationen aus dem Schaffen der Frankfurter und Homburger Jahre Diss Munster *Emsdetten*: Lechte, 1939 64 pp.
- Steude, Heinz**—Die Wiederentdeckung Gimmelshausens durch die Romantik und ihre deutsche Bedeutung Diss *Wurzburg* Mayr, 1939 169 pp
- Stockli, Alban**—Der Dichter Rudolf von Ins, Schreiber auf der Au bei Bremgarten Eine literarische Skizze *Wohltau, Aargau*: Meyer [1939]. 20 pp. Fr 2.
- Das Zeugnis Ulrichs von Singenberg über Walther von der Vogelweide [Aus Ostschweiz 1940]. [*Stans, Schweiz*. P Alban Stockli], 1940. 16 pp
- Der Minnesanger von Trossberg. Eine literarische Studie [*Stans, Schweiz*: P Alban Stockli] 1940 17 pp.
- Streinz, Franz**—Die Flurnamen der Gemeinde Bergersdorf [Arbeitskreis für Volkskunde Flugschriftenreihe Nr. 1]. *Iglau*: Selbstverl 1939 9 pp
- Usinger, Fritz**—Geist und Gestalt. *Darmstadt*: Darmstädter Verl. 1939. 155 pp. M. 5 40
- Waggener, Karl Heinrich**—Das Jahr des Herrn Edited with Introduction, Notes and Vocabulary by Jane F. Goodloe With a Foreword by P. G. Gleis. *New York*: F. S Crofts & Co, 1941. xi, 234 pp. \$1.40

Wall, Fr. Wilh. de.—Studien zum Stil der "Kudrun." Diss. Königsberg. *Dusseldorf*: Nolte, 1939. iv, 75 pp

Wartburgkrieg, Der. Kritisch herausgegeben von Dr. T. A. Rompelman. *Amsterdam*. 1939. vi, 355 pp. Fl. 5 25

FRENCH

Barton, F. B., and Sirich, E. H.—Simplified Fr. Review Grammar and Composition. *New York*: Crofts, 1941. xiv + 219 pp. \$1.60

Baym, Max I.—Baudelaire and Shakespeare. Reprinted from the Shakespeare Ass. Bulletin, XV, nos. 3 and 4. 29 pp

Dettmer, Gustav.—Die Geisteshaltung Clément Marots auf Grund seiner religionsatirischen Lyrik. Diss. *Greifswald*. 1940. 106 pp

Dow, Neal.—The Concept and Term "Nature" in Montaigne's *Essays*. U. of Pa. diss., 1940. x + 68 pp

Grubbs, H. A.—Jean-Baptiste Rousseau, his life and works. *Princeton*: Princeton U. Press, 1941. viii + 310 pp. \$3.00

Leitolf, Otto.—Die Gedankenwelt von Henri Massis [Romanische Studien H. 53]. Munich diss. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1940. 118 pp. M. 4 80.

March, Harold.—Types of the Fr. Short Story, ed. H. M. *New York*: Nelson, 1941. 339 pp. \$1.50

Monod-Cassidy, Hélène.—Un voyageur-philosophe au XVIII^e s., l'abbé J.-B. Le Blanc. *Cambridge*: Harvard U. Press, 1941. xiii + 565 pp. \$5.00

Rosenfield, Lenora Cohen.—From Beast-Machine to Man-Machine. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1941. xxviii + 353 pp. \$3.50

Saylor, G. R.—Alphonse Daudet as a Dramatist. U. of Pa. diss., 1940. vi + 122 pp.

Schwarz, H. S.—Lever de Rideau, six one-act mod. comedies. *New York*: Dryden Press, 1940. xiv + 233 pp. \$1.35

Société historique franco-américaine, les Quarante Ans de la. Conférences, allocutions et discours. Préface de G. Chinard. *Boston*: 1940. 878 pp

Van der Wal, J. S.—Charles de Bernard (1804-50). *Amsterdam* diss., 1940. 274 pp.

ITALIAN

Buonocore, O.—S. Pietro nella Divina Commedia. *Napoli*: tip. Portosalvo, 1939. 44 pp

Burch, E. (ed.).—Lettere inedite del Capponi ad A. Reumont. (In aggiunta una lettera del Tommaseo). *Fiume*: Termini, 1940. 63 pp.

Cioffari, Vincenzo.—The Conception of Fortune and Fate in the Works of Dante.

Cambridge, Mass: Dante Society, 1940. 40 pp

Contini, G.—Esercizi di lettura sopra autori contemporanei con un'appendice su testi non contemporanei. *Firenze*: Parenti, 1939. 303 pp

Machiavelli, Niccolò.—The Prince and Other Works, including Reform in Florence, Castiuccio Castracani, On Fortune, Letters, Ten Discourses on Livy. New Translations, Introductions and Notes by Allan H. Gilbert. *Chicago*: Packard and Co., 1941. 336 pp. \$1.00 (University Classics)

Momo, A.—La lirica di Torquato Tasso. *Milano*: tip. Vitagliano, 1939. 183 pp

Rezza, C.—Impressioni e note sul libro delle rime di Fr. Sacchetti. *Empoli*: tip. dei Comuni, 1939. 129 pp

Sapegno, N.—Tecnica, poetica e poesia nelle opere giovanili di Dante. A cura di G. Berretta. *Roma*: Casa ed. Castellani, 1939. 184 pp

Speroni, Charles.—Proverbs and Proverbial Phrases in Basile's "Pentameron." *Berkeley and Los Angeles*: University of California Press, 1941. (Univ. of Calif. Publications in Modern Philology, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 181-288)

Spini, G. (ed.).—Il granduca di Toscana Cosimo de' Medici. Lettere. Con prefaz. di A. Panella. *Firenze*: Vallecchi, 1940. xvi + 221 pp

SPANISH

Galdós, Pérez.—La Batalla de los Arapiles, ed. J. B. Rael. *New York*: Odyssey Press, 1941. xiv + 194 pp. \$1.00

García Prada, C.—Luz que flota en el olvido. *México*: Imprenta Universitaria, 1939. 131 pp. \$1.20

Guzmán, Augusto.—Hist. de la novela boliviana. *La Paz*: Revista México, 1938. 216 pp.

Hommage à E. Martineche. *Paris*: d'Artrey (1939). 537 pp

Lincoln, J. N.—Guide to the Bibliog. and Hist. of Hispano-Amer. Lit. *Ann Arbor*: 1939. 43 pp

Manzoni, A. C.—El indio en la poesía de América. *Buenos Aires*: Torres, 1939

Mendez Plancarte, Gabriel.—Horacio en México. *México*: Eds. de la Univ. nacional, 1937. xxviii + 333 pp

GENERAL

Analecta AEGYPTIACA. Vol. I: Kopenhagener Texte zum demotischen Weisheitsbuch, ed. Aksel Volten. *Copenhagen*: Munksgaard, 1940. Kr. 30.

Chambrun, R. de.—De la Lorraine à Washington (trad. de l'anglais, "I saw France fall"). *New York*: Brentano's, 1941. 237 pp.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LVI

MAY, 1941

Number 5

THE DARK HINTS OF SIR JOHN HAWKINS AND BOSWELL

No portion of Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, as he foresaw, has been so unpopular with the commentators as that in which he attributes Johnson's agonies of remorse in his last days to the recollection of sexual irregularities into which he had been led by Savage years before.¹ Croker feels obliged to declare his opinion that "Boswell's introduction of this topic, his pretended candour, and hollow defence, were unwarranted by any evidence, and are the most, indeed almost the only, discreditable parts of his whole work." In another note he is even more condemnatory. he speaks of "sinister authority," "low and filthy guilt," "calumniated friend," "hearsay or . . . guess," and concludes that "Boswell's good sense, good taste, and good feeling, must have . . . given way under some powerful *self-delusion*."² Fitzgerald expands this into an explicit charge that Boswell gratuitously inserted the passage to pay off Johnson for not remembering him in his will, and to sanction his own shortcomings.³ Dr. Hill is silent, but Dr. Powell says the whole thing comes down to "vague insinuations."⁴

¹ *Life of Samuel Johnson*, ed. G. B. Hill and L. F. Powell, 1934, iv. 395-8 (Hereafter referred to as *Life*.)

² *Life of Samuel Johnson*, ed. J. W. Croker, 1831, v. 306 n. 1, 309 n. 1. In the (later) one-vol. edition the notes are somewhat different, but no less violent.

³ Percy Fitzgerald, *Boswell's Autobiography*, 1912, pp. 265-71. No one who knows Fitzgerald will be surprised to find that this reverses his earlier opinion in his edition of the *Life* (1874, iii. 157, n. 1). There he thought that "the evidence of Hawkins and Boswell, who had seen [Johnson's] private diaries, is more to be relied on than such speculations as Mr. Croker's."

⁴ *Life*, iii. 552

Mr. W. B. C. Watkins has reopened the discussion in his recent study of Swift, Johnson, and Sterne (*Perilous Balance*, cf below, pp 394-5). He does real service by bringing out clearly the fact that Hawkins first made the charge, and that Boswell, though he wrote at greater length, really says no more than his predecessor. His conclusion is that "while it is possible that Boswell refers to some secret confidence, it seems fairly clear that Hawkins is merely making the rash assumption on the basis that Johnson knew intimately a man of dissolute morals. . . His sense of sin is explicable on other grounds."⁵

The topic is an ungracious one, but since it is apparently always going to be discussed, we had better have somewhere a full and detached statement of the evidence so far as Hawkins and Boswell are concerned. Mr. Watkins does not take into account material in Boswell's journal that is much to the point.

In the first place, I think we can dismiss the suggestion of a secret confidence. So far as is known, Boswell never heard from Johnson himself any confession of sexual irregularity, and there is no record that he ever questioned him on the subject. He told Sir John Pringle in 1776 that he did not dare to.⁶ Peter Garrick—not a very close friend of Johnson—told Boswell in 1775 that it was suspected that Johnson had seduced "a Lady, a very fine woman"; this Boswell thought "not very probable."⁷ It does not appear that he had from any of Johnson's intimate friends any trustworthy evidence for his guarded and apparently reluctant statement that Johnson "after he came to London, and had associated with Savage and others, was not so strictly virtuous, in one respect, as when he was a younger man."⁸

I have no doubt that his authority was Hawkins. On 7 May 1785 Boswell met Hawkins at Bennet Langton's. His journal for that day has the following:

"Sir J. Hawkins and I did very well. Stood in a corner, and talked grave and earnest. He accounted for Johnson's fear of death: 'I have read his diary. I wish I had not read so much. He

⁵ W. B. C. Watkins, *Perilous Balance*, 1939, pp. 51, 53

⁶ *Private Papers of James Boswell from Malahide Castle*, 1928-34, xi 233 (10 April 1776) (Hereafter referred to as *Private Papers*)

⁷ *Ibid.*, x. 142 (24 March 1775).

⁸ *Life*, iv. 395.

had strong amorous passions.' Bos 'But he did not indulge them?' HAWK. 'I have said enough.'"⁹

In his entry for 8 July of the next year, the day before he began the composition of the *Life*, occurs the following cryptic sentence.

"Drank tea at Langton's and had a conference with him and Sir John Hawkins upon a delicate question, which Langton assured me I weighed and decided upon as well as he could suppose it to be done."¹⁰

The language of the *Life* is reminiscent of these passages. "I am to mention (with all possible respect and *delicacy*, however) that his conduct. . . . It was well known that his *amorous inclinations* were uncommonly strong and impetuous"

It is of the first importance to know what Hawkins had read, but I fear that certainty is impossible. The fragmentary private diaries now known to exist contain nothing to support his charge, though it should be noted that none of them covers the period of Johnson's early life in London. We know, however, from Boswell that Johnson had another record, "a full, fair, and most particular account of his own life" in two quarto volumes. Boswell was not speaking on hearsay; he had once accidentally seen and had surreptitiously read "a great deal" in them, but as he confessed his guilt to Johnson, who treated him "placidly," it is not likely that he found anything discreditable.¹¹ Hawkins also looked into at least one of these volumes, and it may be that he perused it. According to his own account he went on Sunday 5 December 1784, eight days before Johnson's death, to partake the Holy Communion with him. Several other people had been invited Hoole, his wife and son, Langton, Mrs. Gardiner, young Desmoulins, Frank the negro, and the Reverend George Strahan, who officiated. While Johnson was dressing and preparing himself, he missed a paper containing instructions to his executors. and several of the company went into his bedroom to search for it. Hawkins came upon a parchment-covered book, and opened it, thinking the paper might be inside. Finding it to be "meditations and reflections" in Johnson's hand, he slipped it into his pocket, together with a lesser MS. book of Johnson's, his excuse being that he wished to secure it from George Steevens, who would have got it if he could.

⁹ *Private Papers*, xvi 84

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, xvi 203 (8 July 1786).

¹¹ *Life*, iv. 405-6.

and would have "made an ill use of it." He however told Langton and Strahan what he had done, Langton warned Johnson. As soon as the celebration was over (that is, at the first possible moment) Johnson, in great agitation, demanded the book back.¹² The two quarto volumes disappeared, having been burnt, as Boswell believed, by Johnson himself.¹³

Every man will judge of the value of this. It can be said that Hawkins was a puritan, a prig, and a good deal of an ass, that he was quite capable of reading into the existing diaries something that was not there, that, in spite of what Boswell says, it is not certain that the volumes he pocketed were the "particular account", that even if they were, he did not have time or opportunity really to read them (he told Boswell he wished he "had not read so much"), etc., etc. It can also be argued that the conference between Hawkins, Langton, and Boswell had nothing to do with the matter under discussion. It took place in the summer of 1786, a year before Hawkins published his biography. Why should not Boswell have waited to see what his rival would say? Under the circumstances, would Hawkins have told him anything?

For my own part I cannot think Hawkins so hasty or Boswell so credulous. Both men, I think, would have preferred not to find anything of the kind. It is easier for me to believe that Sir John lied about the length of time that he had the lost journal in his possession than that his hints to Boswell were baseless. For that matter, if he had opened the book at the right place, he might have needed no more than a few seconds to read something that would have made him wish he "had not read so much." It is undoubtedly odd that Boswell should have read "a great deal" in the same record without finding anything of the kind that shocked Sir John.

¹² (Sir) John Hawkins, *Life of Samuel Johnson*, 2d ed., 1787, p. 586. It is interesting and perhaps important to note that none of this was in his first edition. Hawkins does not name Steevens, but as Boswell says, describes him "so as to make it sufficiently clear who is meant." His daughter, Lætitia Matilda Hawkins, supplies the name (*Memoirs*, i. 265). The material from Hawkins, with Boswell's commentary, is conveniently found in G. B. Hill's *Johnsonian Miscellanies*, 1897, ii. 128-30. The list of persons who were present at the celebration is partly from Hawkins and partly from John Hoole's narrative (*Ibid.*, ii. 155).

¹³ See note 11.

I am well aware of the danger of connecting the conference in Langton's presence with the earlier conversation. Hawkins and Boswell no doubt had many "delicate" questions to discuss. I can only say that the parallelism in wording between the journal and the *Life* is most suggestive. The entry for 8 July 1786 occurs in a fully written portion of the journal, its cryptic quality is not at all due to a wish for condensation. Boswell is deliberately concealing something, a practice very rare with him. I should say that there are not above half a dozen places in his entire record in which he shows such caution. Caution in Boswell's journal generally means that some other person is involved; as for himself, he had a feeling that he wished nothing concerning himself to be kept secret. My own interpretation of this entry is that he arranged the meeting with Hawkins in order to ask him *what* he had read in the diary, taking care to have Langton present, not merely because Hawkins thought better of Langton than of most men, but also because Langton knew all about the pocketed book. I believe that Hawkins was persuaded to talk, and that Boswell, after "weighing" what he was told "decided" that the facts were as he adumbrates them in the *Life*.¹⁴

FREDERICK A. POTTLE

Yale University

FROMONT, A TRAITOR IN THE CHANSONS DE GESTE

A character by the name of Fromont plays a rôle of the first importance in *Garin le Loherain* and throughout the entire *Loherain* cycle of which *Garin* forms the nucleus.¹ We also find a Fro-

¹⁴I have not referred to the passage from *Thraliana* which Dr Powell quotes in this connection (*Life*, iv 552), because I read it differently. Mrs. Thrale does not mean to say that Johnson confessed to having been under the dominion of "some Woman" at a period of his life before she knew him. She herself is the woman, and Johnson came under her dominion (put himself in her power) by trusting her "with a Secret far dearer to him than his Life." The nature of the secret is not revealed. Professor Balderston, on the evidence of other passages in *Thraliana*, thinks it was a confession that he feared insanity, or thought he had been insane. See her forthcoming edition, p. 384 n. 4.

¹Cf my edition of *Anseys de Mes* (Paris, 1939), genealogical table and chap. 1, see also *Histoire Littéraire de la France* Paris; H. Welter, 1895,

mont in the principal villainous role in *Jourdain de Blavvres*.² In *Berthe aus grans piés*³ a reference is made to this character from the *Loherain* cycle, while in *Gaydon*⁴ there is mention of 'Fromont dou gaut foillu,' by which is doubtless meant the forest at Lens where Begon was killed. Langlois, probably on the strength of this, considers him as belonging to the 'lignage des traîtres'.² Fromonts are mentioned also in *Ogier le Danors*, *Raoul de Cambrai*, and *Otinel*, but in this latter group there is nothing in the poem to indicate whether they are traitors or sympathetic personages. They are merely spoken of as knights who are killed in battle or are present at the court of Charlemagne.² Finally, this traitor appears again in the Dutch poem *Les Enfants de Lumbourg*. Huet believes that here the character is borrowed from the Dutch version of the *Loherain* cycle.⁴

What is the origin of this notorious personality who left so important an imprint upon the literature of the Middle Ages? Did he have any real existence or was he merely a creation of one of the writers of *chansons de geste*?

The writer of this article has long been interested in the question of an historical basis for the *Loherain* cycle. It will be remembered that Ferdinand Lot studied this problem in his article *L'Élément historique de Garin le Lorrain*. He reluctantly came to the conclusion that this historical basis was non-existent.⁵ He was able to identify several very minor characters, 'des comparses,' with some real persons of the late 12th century, but admitted that they might be interpolations of copyists.⁶ This subject has also been treated to some extent in my edition of *Anseys de Mes*.⁷ In an effort to clarify this matter a little further I have consulted a number of Latin

xxii, 604 ff. For a discussion of the name Fromont in the *chansons de geste* see R. K. Bowman, *The Connection of the Geste des Loherains with other French Epics and Medieval Genres* (New York 1940), pp. 81-85.

² E. Langlois, *Table des noms propres de toute nature compris dans les chansons de geste* (Paris: Émile Bouillon, 1904), pp. 242-243.

³ *Berthe aus grans piés*, ed. A. Scheler (Bruxelles: Closson et Cie., 1874), p. 91, *Gaydon*, ed. F. Guessard (Paris: F. Vieweg, 1859), p. 207.

⁴ G. Huet, "La Version néerlandaise des Lorrains, Nouvelles études," *Romania*, xxxiv, 1905, p. 2.

⁵ F. Lot, *L'Élément historique de Garin le Lorrain*, in *Études d'histoire au Moyen-Âge* (Paris: Cerf et Alcan, 1896), pp. 201 and 215.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 201 and 211.

⁷ *Anseys*, chap. VIII.

chronicles in Migne's *Patrologia*, as a result of which the following was brought to light

According to the Annals of Flodoard⁸ (894-966?), in the year 941, Fromont, count of Sens, arbitrarily unseated Gerlan, the archbishop of that city, because the latter had shown favor to one Wallon, whose suzerain, Count Herbert of Champagne, had previously expelled Fromont from the same city.⁹

Next there occurred an excommunication launched against Rainard, count of Sens, and his son Rodmundus or Frotmundus. This forms part of a group of works called *Appendix Actorum Veterum*, forming a supplement to *Regino Priemiensis Abbas*¹⁰. Neither the date nor the precise reasons for the excommunication are given. The editor of this chronicle here comes to our assistance, however. Basing his arguments on quotations from two chronicles, i. e. *Spicilegium Dachernum*, vol. 10, p. 635, and *Chronicon sancti Petri Senonensis*, he furnishes the missing information.¹¹

It appears that in 976 the archbishop died, and Rainardus wanted the position to pass into his own immediate family.¹² When, despite the count's delaying tactics, one Segun was elected and consecrated, the former forbade the new archbishop the approaches

⁸ Flodoardus canonicus Remensis—*Annales* in J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Latinae Cursus Completus*, Paris: Garnier Frères, 1879, cxxxv.

⁹ 'Gerlanus Senonensis Archiepiscopus urbe sua depellitur a Frotmundo quem Hugo Albus eidem civitati praefecerat, culpato Gerlando quod Waloni faverit, homini Heriberti comitis, qui Frotmundum vel suos a praefata expulerat urbe' *Ibid.*, col. 456, year DCCCXLI.

¹⁰ This Appendix was compiled by Stéphane Baluze (1630-1718) and appears in Migne, *op. cit.*, vol. 132, col. 473 ff. For Rodmundum = Frotmundum, see n. 13 below.

¹¹ 'Quia tamen satis hactenus cognitum non fuit quo tempore ea [i. e. excommunicatio ista] lata sit, quamve ob causam, cum praeterea res sit quae maxime pertinet ad institutum nostrum, visum est illam hic recudere cum observationibus nostris' *Ibid.*, col. 473. I was unable to locate the chronicles which Stéphane Baluze quotes, viz. the *Spicilegium* and *Chronicon sancti Petri* mentioned above. It will be noted, however, in what detail his interpretation is corroborated by other chronicles which I quote below, and of which Baluze must presumably have been unaware, since he does not quote them.

¹² 'Anno DCCCCLXXVI, cum Anastasius Senonensis archiepiscopus obisset, Ragenardus urbis illius comes, qui pontificatum in familiam suam inferre cupiebat, novi antistitis electionem turbavit spatio quinque mensium' *Ibid.*, col. 473.

to the city of Sens, although this incumbent was the count's own nephew. The prelate's reply was to put the entire province of Sens under an interdict, and to proclaim the aforementioned excommunication.¹³

However, many years later, long after this controversy had died down, the succession to the archbishopric of Sens caused a new tempest, almost exactly similar to the previous one.

In 999 Seguin died. Shortly before this, Rainard had died, and had been succeeded by his son Fromont, who now wished the post for his son Bruno. A number of other ambitious clerics angled for the position, so that a veritable schism occurred.¹⁴ When the electors chose one Leodoric, Fromont resorted to the same tactics which his father had previously employed against Seguin.¹⁴ According to our editor, since the situation was exactly parallel to that of 976, the same excommunication was used, only the names being changed.¹⁵

Then there is an account by Rodulfus Glaber (c 1048) in which we are told how in 1008 the aforementioned Leodoric found some holy relics that immediately began to perform miracles.¹⁶ Sens

¹³ 'Tandem Seguinus, filius sororis eiusdem Ragenardi, eo invito electus et consecratus apud Autissiodorum est III idus Junii Venientem deinde eum Senonas Ragenardus aditu urbis prohibuit Videns hoc autem ipse archiepiscopus ut ait Clarius in Chronico sancti Petri Vivi Senonensis, omnem provinciam interdixit a Kalendis Octobris usque in caput jejunii Eo igitur tempore facta est ista excommunicatio adversus Ragenardum comitem et Rodmundum eius filium (quem Frotmundum vocat idem Clarius) quia Seguinum, postquam archiepiscopalem benedictionem susceperat, sanctum Sennensis ecclesiae locum ingredi non permiserant, ut legitur in excommunicatione' *Ibid*, col. 473

¹⁴ 'Post mortem Seguni, quae anno DCCCCLXXXIX contigit xvi Kal. Novembri, rursum tempestas in Ecclesia Senonensi Nam cum Frotmundus comes qui Ragenardo patri non ita multo antecesserat, Brunonem filium Senonibus dari vellet episcopum, eodemque tempore plurimi etiam clericorum (ut Clarius ait) id est, canonicorum, ambitionibus episcopatum appeterent, ingens schisma facta est in Ecclesia, quia neque Bruno neque ullus canonicorum qui episcopari volebant ad eam dignitatem pervenire potuit, eligentium votis in Leothericum archidiaconum convenientibus Ea de causa Frotmundus adversus ipsum commotus, ei post consecrationem ad sedem suam accedenti portas clausit et urbis introitum denegavit, ut legitur apud Tavellum.' *Ibid*, col 473

¹⁵ 'Cum ergo eadem tum excommunicandi causae essent quae Seguinum aaderant ista decernere adversus Ragenardum eius filium, placuit uti eadem formula mutatis nominibus.' *Ibid*, col. 473.

¹⁶ Rodulfus Glaber, *Cluniacensis Monachus*, in Migne, *op. cit.*, cxxiii, col. 655.

became a tourist attraction, therefore very opulent. Because of this new found prosperity the inhabitants grew very arrogant.¹⁶ The worst offender in this respect, however, was the count himself, Rainard, who had succeeded his father Fromont.¹⁷ This Rainard is described as a detractor of the Christian faith and pitiless in his dealings with the poor. Furthermore, he was a renegade and 'followed the false customs of the Jews.'¹⁸ For this reason the king, who had frequently cautioned him because of his iniquitous ways, was finally persuaded to send a punitive expedition against him, adding Sens to the royal domain. Rainard was then ejected from his city which was sacked and burned.¹⁹

Another chronicler, Hugo de Sancta Maria (c. 1117), recounts the events of the year 999, mentioned above as having led to the excommunication of Fromont of Sens, in somewhat greater detail.

Old Rainard, after having perpetrated many evil deeds, died in 996, and was succeeded by his son Fromont.²⁰ Leodoric, the people's

¹⁷ 'nimium quippe flagitiosus effectus, ecclesiae insuper decus, nisu quo valebat foedare tentabat' *Ibid*, col 656

¹⁸ 'Judaeorum quoque in tantum praevericatorias diligebat consuetudines, ut se regem ipsorum suo praenomine, Rainardus quippe dicebatur, suis omnibus imperaret. Cum enim in caeteris mendacissimus, etiam Christianae fidei insidiosus habebatur detractor. Atque ideo pauperum indicia absque ulla promulgabat pietate, penitus humanitate remota' *Ibid*, col 656. 'He loved so greatly the customs and prevarications of the Jews that he ordered all his people [to give him] as a prenom [the title of] King of the Jews (ipsorum). For, since he was in other matters a great liar, he also was held to be an insidious detractor of the Christian religion. He also pronounced against the poor judgments devoid of any [feeling of] pity or humanity.' See also note 19, 'Rainardo . . . judaizante.'

¹⁹ 'Praeterea Rainardo, ut diximus, judaizante, quin potius insaniante, suusum est regi, qui videlicet illum frequenter ob suam improbitatem redarguerat, ut scilicet tantae civitatis principatum regio subjugaret dominio, ne siquidem diutius vires pessimi incrementi sumeret scandalum sacrae fidei. Qua ratione rex compulsus, misit exercitum, qui praedictum Rainardum a civitati pellerent, sibi illam tuendam servarent. Vementes vero qui missi fuerant a rege, ceperunt urbem cum nimia depopulatione, partem etiam eius non modicam incendio cremavere' *Ibid*, 657.

²⁰ Hugo de Sancta Maria, *Floriacensis Monachus*, in Migne, *op cit.*, CLXIII. 'Igitur Rainaldus comes vetulus Senonum post multa perpetrata mala defunctus est . . . cui successit Frotmundus, filius eius . . .' col 862, 863.

choice for bishop, was opposed by several ambitious candidates. Fromont, 'who stemmed from a bad race,' was especially relentless in his opposition because he wanted the appointment of his own son Bruno. Nevertheless, Leodoric was elected.²¹

Upon the death of Fromont, his son Rainard succeeded him. The latter, 'a worthless infidel, persecuted the Christian Church and its faithful with a fury unheard of from the days of the Pagans to this very day.' Archbishop Leodoric, not knowing which way to turn, prayed to Christ for His divine intercession.²² Thereupon, at the advice of the Bishop of Paris, Sens was sacked and given over to King Robert and Leodoric. Rainard fled naked from the city. His brother Fromont, who, together with some soldiers, offered continued resistance to the king, was captured and imprisoned in Orleans, where he died.²³ This recital from Hugo de Sancta Maria appears in literally identical form in Ordericus Vitalis

²¹ 'At clamabat autem omnis populus sibi ordinari domnum Leothericum, nobilissimis ortum natalibus, tunc archidiaconum, omni bonitate conspicuum, sed resistebant quam plurimi clerici, cupientes episcopalem conscendere gradum. Praecipue vero Frotmundus comes, filius Rainaldi vetuli, natus ex mala radice, hoc non permittebat fieri, eo quod haberet filium clericum, nomine Brunonem, volens de eo facere episcopum. Dei autem nutu congregati suffraganei episcopi Senonicae ecclesiae, cum voluntate et auctoritate apostolica, sublato omni timore humano, sollempniter ordinaverunt domnum Leothericum in sede pontificali, ut preesset ecclesiae Senonensi.' Col. 864.

²² 'Mortuo itaque Frotmundo comite Senonum, successit ei Rainardus, filius eius, infidelium nequissimus. Hic persecutionem intulit ecclesiae Christi et fidelibus eius, quanta non est audita a tempore paganorum usque in hodiernum diem. Archiepiscopus autem Leothericus nimis angustatus pro hac re, quo se verteret omnino nesciebat. Totum vero se Domino committens, in orationibus et vigiliis exorabat Christum ut ei superna pietas auxilium ministraret.' col. 864.

²³ 'Igitur anno a passione Domine MXV, indictione XIII, X Kal. Maii capta est civitas Senonum ab archiepiscopo Leotherico per consilium Rainardi Parisiensis presulis, et regi tradita Roberto. Rainardus comes eiusdem urbis fugiens nudus evasit. [Nec immerito. Talem enim persecutionem Christianis intulerat, qualis non fuerat audita a tempore paganorum. Quam ob rem predictus archiepiscopus sapienti usus consilio, vi ab urbe compulsi exire.] Frotmundus vero, frater eius, et ceteri milites de civitate ingressi in turrem quae est in civitate, obtinuerunt eam. Rex autem oppugnans eam diebus multis, cepit eam et fratrem Rainardi comitis Frotmundum duxit in carcerem Aurelianis civitate, ubi et defunctus est.' Col. 864.

(1075-1143).²⁴ It is not important for our purpose to determine which writer copied from the other.

To anyone familiar with the *Loherain* cycle, the activities of the Rainard-Fromont family in the chronicles have an unmistakably familiar ring.—their being considered renegades and attackers of the Christian religion,²⁵ their arbitrary blocking of appointments to vacant posts,²⁶ their defying of royal and ecclesiastical authority,²⁷ the fact that some members of the family were in holy orders,²⁸ finally, the insistent references of the chroniclers to members of this old family such as Fromont as being 'natus ex mala radice,'²⁹ or 'vetulus Rainaldus'³⁰ as dying 'post multa perpetrata mala.'³¹

If we juxtapose with the above facts the career of the Bordelais clan in the *Loherain* poem, we find the following: Fromont renounced Christianity and led an army of Saracens from Spain against Christian France;³² the initial quarrel between the Loherains and the Bordelais arose over the disposition by the king of a fief which had suddenly become vacant,³³ both Bernart de Naisil, uncle of Fromont, and Fromondin, son of Fromont, were at one time in holy orders,³⁴ very frequent pejorative references are made in the poem to the treacherous and evil background of Fromont and his family.³⁵

²⁴ Ordericus Vitalis *Historiae Ecclesiasticae* in Migne, *op. cit.*, vol. CLXXXVIII, col 513

²⁵ Cf notes 18, 22, 23 above

²⁶ Cf notes 13, 14

²⁹ Cf. note 21

²⁷ Cf notes 9, 13, 14, 21, 22

³⁰ Cf note 20.

²⁸ Cf. notes 12, 14, 21

³¹ Cf note 20

³² *Anseys*, p. 19, also *Girbert de Mes*, Paris. ms N, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, 3143, folio 115r

³³ *Anseys*, pp 17, 18 In general, throughout the geste the Bordelais display an attitude of open defiance toward the king At one point, for example, Fromont invades the royal palace with an armed force, attempting to assault the king while the latter is being waited upon at table by the Loherains (cf. *Girbert*, *op. cit.*, 93v.)

³⁴ *Anseys*, p 20; E DuMéril, *La Mort de Garin le Lorrain* (Paris: Franck, 1846), pp 153, 163

³⁵ e g Queen Blanchefleur taunts Fromont with being 'du lignage Garlain, Le traiteur qui meurtri son parain,' *Girbert*, *op. cit.* 106v; another of the Bordelais, Isoré li gris, a relative of Fromont, is reproached as follows: 'no wonder you are a traitor, in view of your ancestry' ('Bien

We thus have a three-fold connection—a name, a personality, a pattern of action—the very stuff of which poets, especially those who composed the French *chansons de geste*, were wont to weave their many-colored fabrics. Is it not therefore possible that this family, which played so important a rôle locally as to invite the interference of the King of France and excommunication by contemporary archbishops, may have left so strong an impression on posterity that the name Fromont suggested itself as an obvious choice for a powerful and scheming traitor when the *chansons de geste* came to be composed some hundred or hundred and fifty years later?³⁶

If so, why should Fromont have been transported from his native Sens to Flanders and Artois, where we find him in the *Loherain* cycle?

In the first place, there is considerable resemblance between *s* and *l* as they are written in most mediaeval manuscripts, and that may have had something to do with Fromont de Sens becoming Fromont de Lens when the poet was dealing with the latter region. Secondly, there is a somewhat more direct connection between Sens and the city of Metz, which may be called the central city of the *Loherain* cycle.

In 775 Charlemagne had placed under Angelram, Bishop of

le dois faire, de tel gent es naquies'), *Garin le Loherain*, ed. P. Paris, Paris: Techener, 1833, I, 171, or again,

Sire Fromons, ce dist Garins li fiers,
Bien avez fait quant m'avez acointié
De traison, ne vous puis blastengier.
Garlain vostre aive ne volez forlignier
Qui son pariaim murdrir en un mostier,
A son signor-lige coupa le chief
Et son cousin fit en un sac noier' *Ibid.*, I, 130

In the *Anseys*, Pépin, complaining of Fromont's family, says 'trop ai en eus trové de faussetez' *Anseys*, line 3744

³⁶ The fact that parts of the cycle have been, rightly or wrongly, ascribed to Jean de Flagy, a Champenois (cf. P. Paris, *op. cit.* I, xix), that Sens and the Sénonais formed part of the old province of Champagne (cf. P. Joanne, *Dict. géog. et admin. de la France*, Paris, 1905, VII, 4602), that a linguistic study has revealed many Champenois characteristics (*Anseys*, pp. 63, 67, 68 par. 21 and 23) would seem to lend some support to this hypothesis. M. Charles Bruneau in a letter which I received from him, dated April 24, 1940, remarks of the *Anseys* 'certains traits me font songer à la Champagne'

Metz, the 'régale de l'abbaye de Sénonès, qui de monastère royal devint ainsi abbaye épiscopale et vint augmenter le domaine temporel de l'évêché.'³⁷ The bishops of Metz extended their power, acquiring civil and criminal jurisdiction toward the end of the ninth century.³⁷ This may account for the shifting of the exploits of Fromont and his family to Metz and the *Loherain* cycle.

As for the chief opponent of Fromont II, i. e. Leodoric—ought we to infer any connection between him and a priest of the same name in the *Garin*, who for a moment assumes a fairly important rôle in that poem, i. e. the Abbé Liétris, a member of the Loherain family, who adopts an intransigent attitude when Begon, brother of Garin, is killed in Fromont's forest?³⁸

If it should be granted that the deeds of this Sénonais family are really connected with *Garin le Loherain*, one might now place its origin at a much earlier date than F Lot was willing to assign to it,³⁹ even as early as the beginning of the eleventh century. This was the date given by French critics of the early nineteenth century, such as Paulin Paris, Edeléstand DuMéril, and Leroux de Lincy, who based their reasoning purely on archaeological data.⁴⁰ It also corresponds very closely with the dates I suggested in my edition of *Anseys de Mes*, on the basis of certain historical events which I there pointed out.⁴¹

HERMAN J. GREEN

New York City

³⁷ L. Schaudel, *Les Comtes de Salm et l'abbaye de Senones aux 12^e et 13^e siècles* (Nancy-Strasbourg-Paris. Berger-Levrault, 1921), p. 10.

³⁸ P Paris, *op cit*, II, 249 ff. This character in the poem is referred to as Liederich by F Mone, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Teutschen Heldensaga* (Leipzig Basse, 1835), p. 235. He gives as Latin variants of this name Leudericus and Liedricus, *ibid.*, 235 n. 1.

³⁹ I. e. end of the 12th century; cf. Lot, *op. cit.*, pp. 215, 216.

⁴⁰ P Paris, *op. cit.*, I, XVIII, E. DuMéril, *op cit.*, xxxiii, xlii. Leroux de Lincy, *Analyse critique et littéraire du roman de Garin le Loherain* (Paris Techener, 1835), p. 87.

⁴¹ *Anseys*, p. 61.

SUR DEUX LETTRES DE BAUDELAIRE

Une lettre, non datée, adressée à Mme Sabatier, commençant par les mots. "Très chère amie, C'est jouer de malheur . . .," a été insérée par les compilateurs de *Charles Baudelaire, Lettres (1841-1866)* entre le 31 août et le 8 septembre 1857. Et M. Y-G. Le Dantec lui a conservé cette place dans son édition de la *Correspondance*.¹

Trois détails de cette lettre prouvent cependant que l'année 1857 est hors de question.

1° Baudelaire prie Mme Sabatier de dire à Christophe "qu'il faut absolument qu'il vienne demain, lundi soir, dîner chez moi à l'Hôtel de Dieppe." Or, nous savons qu'en 1857 Baudelaire logeait à l'Hôtel Voltaire, 19 quai Voltaire, et qu'il loua une chambre à l'hôtel de Dieppe, 22 rue d'Amsterdam, seulement lors de son retour de Honfleur, au plus tôt vers le commencement de juillet 1859, et qu'il y demeura jusqu'au 15 décembre 1860, moment où il s'installa à Neuilly, 4, rue Louis-Philippe.²

2° Baudelaire apprend une nouvelle à sa correspondante: "Saviez-vous," dit-il, "que l'infortunée señora Martinez roulait dans les cafés lyriques et qu'elle chantait, il y a quelques jours, à l'Alcazar?" D'un article paru dans *Le Ménestrel* du 29 avril 1860, il ressort qu'à cette date l'Alcazar, situé 10 rue du Faubourg-Poissonnière, avait été fondé depuis peu de temps par Joseph Meyer.³

3° Vers la fin de la lettre, Baudelaire raconte à Mme Sabatier qu'il avait "tout récemment" refusé "une charmante invitation de Wagner." C'est le vendredi 17 février 1860 que Baudelaire écrit au musicien allemand pour lui exprimer son admiration. En

¹ *Œuvres complètes*, III, 186-7.

² Le 29 juin 1859, Baudelaire n'avait pas encore choisi son domicile, puisqu'il demande à sa mère d'adresser les lettres à la *Revue française (Dernières Lettres inédites, p. 112)*. En fait, la première lettre où il donne l'Hôtel de Dieppe comme adresse est datée du 27 septembre (*Correspondance*, ed Le Dantec, p. 276).—Le 8 décembre 1860, il écrit à sa mère. "Je crois que je pourrai m'installer vers le 15 (Neuilly, rue Louis-Philippe, numéro 4)." (*Lettres inédites*, p. 209). Le 1er janvier, il écrit de nouveau. "Je suis installé ici (4, rue Louis-Philippe, Neuilly) depuis une quinzaine de jours." (*Ibid.* 210).—Il devait retourner à l'Hôtel de Dieppe vers la fin de 1861. (Cf. Lettre à M. Pelletier du 30 décembre 1861.)

³ L'auteur de l'article souhaitait bonne chance à la nouvelle entreprise.

réponse à cet hommage Wagner invita Baudelaire à venir le voir. Et une lettre du 28 février, adressée à Champfleury, nous apprend que c'est ce jour-là que Baudelaire répondit pour remettre à plus tard la visite attendue "J'écris immédiatement à M. Wagner pour le remercier de tout mon cœur J'irai le voir, mais pas tout de suite. Des affaires assez tristes me prennent tout mon temps. Si vous le voyez avant moi, dites-lui que ce sera pour moi un grand honneur de serrer la main d'un homme de génie, insulté par toute la populace des esprits frivoles." ⁴

Tous ces faits concordent la lettre appartient à l'année 1860 et elle est postérieure au 28 février.

Une autre lettre à Mme Sabatier, celle-là datée du 4 mars 1860, va nous permettre de préciser. Les deux lettres sont en effet inséparables, car elles se raccordent en plusieurs points.

Dans la lettre non datée, s'excusant de ne pas être allé chez Mme Sabatier, le dimanche précédent, Baudelaire donne comme une des raisons de son absence qu'il avait "une peur épouvantable d'être obligé de parler à Feydeau de son dernier roman."—Dans la lettre datée, il annonce que la "grande difficulté est levée" il a "rencontré Feydeau, qui n'a pas lâché une si belle occasion d'entendre parler et de parler de lui."

Dans la lettre non datée, Baudelaire annonce à Mme Sabatier qu'il voulait lui apporter un album, qu'il l'avait fait mettre de côté pour elle, mais il a "préféré tarder un peu et demander d'autres épreuves."—Dans la lettre datée, promettant à sa correspondante d'aller la voir la semaine suivante, Baudelaire ajoute : "J'aurai sans doute l'album." ⁵

Enfin, dans la lettre non datée, Baudelaire dit sur un ton badin à Mme Sabatier : "Si vous supposiez que je ne pense jamais à vous, vous vous tromperiez beaucoup,—et je vous le dirais plus souvent, si vous n'aviez pas adopté pour moi de si vilains vœux."—Dans la lettre datée, il déclare : "Je suis bien aise que vous ayez remarqué la phrase sur vos yeux. Le fait est qu'ils sont fort laids (quand ils le veulent)."

Les deux lettres évidemment se suivent, la lettre non datée précédant l'autre.

⁴ *Correspondance*, éd. Le Dantec, p. 306

⁵ Il s'agissait d'un album de gravures par Méryon, pour qui Baudelaire, à ce moment-là, professait une grande admiration (cf lettres à Poulet-Malassis des 8 janvier et 16 février 1860). Il parle aussi de cet album à sa mère dans une lettre du 4 mars 1860 (*Dernières lettres inédites*, p. 132)

Or, cette lettre non datée fut écrite un dimanche: "Je ne vous ai pas répondu hier," dit en commençant Baudelaire, "alors que je me croyais sûr de venir ce soir chez vous, et, aujourd'hui, comme tant d'autres dimanches, il m'arrive des ennuis qui font que je vais m'enfermer comme une bête féroce" Nous avons vu, d'autre part, qu'il invitait Christophe pour "demain, lundi soir." Mais le 4 mars, en 1860, tombait un dimanche. Entre le 28 février, date limite établie plus haut, qui était un mardi, et le 4 mars, il n'y a pas de place pour un autre dimanche. Les deux lettres ont donc été écrites le même jour, 4 mars 1860.

On peut reconstituer la suite des événements pendant cette journée. Le samedi 3, Mme Sabatier a écrit à Baudelaire pour le presser de venir enfin chez elle à la réunion hebdomadaire du lendemain. Baudelaire ne répond pas tout d'abord. Avait-il, comme il l'a affirmé, l'intention de se rendre rue Frochot? C'est fort douteux, car les ennuis qu'il invoque il les avait déjà mentionnés dans sa lettre à Champfleury plusieurs jours auparavant, et c'est seulement le dimanche, au saut du lit, qu'il s'aperçoit qu'il lui "arrive des ennuis!" Par commissionnaire, sans doute, il envoie une lettre à Mme Sabatier pour se dégager. Mme Sabatier réplique sur le champ, pour insister. Elle a évidemment manifesté des doutes sur la sincérité des raisons alléguées par Baudelaire, puisque celui-ci croit nécessaire de se défendre: "Si je vous dis que j'ai des chagrins énormes, que jamais je n'ai connu pareil orage, que j'ai besoin de solitude, vous ne me croirez pas. Mais, si je vous dis que j'ai le nez rond, gros, et rouge comme une pomme, et que, dans ces cas-là, je ne vais même pas voir les hommes (à plus forte raison les femmes), je suis sûr que vous me croirez." D'où la seconde lettre confirmant l'impossibilité de se rendre chez Mme Sabatier, ce dimanche comme les autres.

L'extraordinaire activité épistolaire des deux correspondants est suggestive. Elle nous laisse entrevoir sur quel pied se poursuivaient, en ce printemps de 1860, les relations de Baudelaire avec la Présidente. Celle-ci n'a pas rompu après la fameuse lettre du 31 août 1857, dans laquelle l'amant de quelques heures, désappointé, l'avait précipitée à bas de son piédestal de "Muse et de Madone." Ceci nous le savions, de même que nous connaissions les efforts de Baudelaire, par la suite, pour éviter de trop fréquentes, et sans doute gênantes, apparitions dans le salon de la rue Frochot. Mais ce dont on ne se doutait pas c'est l'insistance que mettait encore, en 1860, la

maîtresse de maison à attirer chez elle son ancien admirateur. On a supposé que Mme Sabatier, après sa déconvenue, avait, en femme sensée, accepté que l'amour impossible se transformât en une calme et solide amitié. La métamorphose ne s'accomplit pas—si elle s'accomplit jamais—aussi sagement. Entre les lignes des deux lettres du 4 mars on devine toute une manœuvre, non exempte d'impatience, pour reprendre l'impertinent qui envoyait excuse sur excuse et demeurait insaisissable. Baudelaire avait beau multiplier les amabilités, prêter des livres, faire des cadeaux, promettre des albums, comptant que ces petites attentions le dispenseraient de plus intimes prévenances, Mme Sabatier, apparemment, ne désarmait pas. L'offre de "camaraderie" sur laquelle Baudelaire avait insisté, un peu cruellement, dans sa lettre du 2 mai 1858, ne pouvait pas, il faut en convenir, consoler une femme dont l'amour-propre avait été profondément blessé. Les "vilains yeux," auxquels il est fait allusion dans les lettres, nous permettent de supposer que la gracieuse amitié à laquelle Mme Sabatier paraissait se résigner, dissimulait pas mal de dépit et de fureur refoulés. Nous avons là un autre "duellum," sur lequel le poète aurait pu écrire un sonnet moins dramatique que celui qu'il a consacré à Jeanne Duval. Mais Baudelaire ne possédait pas la veine comique.⁶

* * *

"L'infortunée señora Martinez," mentionnée par Baudelaire, était une cantatrice de couleur, connue sous le nom de la "Malibran noire" et qui, pendant une dizaine d'années, de 1850 à 1860, connut le succès à Paris.

Maria del Loreto Martinez, née en 1820 à La Havane, de parents nègres d'origine africaine, se fit remarquer, dès son enfance, par la beauté de sa voix. Le gouverneur espagnol de l'île, Don Francisco Aguilar, la prit chez lui, l'éleva avec ses propres filles et lui fit donner des leçons de musique. Lorsqu'il rentra en Espagne, il emmena la jeune négresse à Séville. Là, Maria Martinez put se familiariser avec les airs et les danses des gitanes et étudier la vieille musique espagnole. Ayant épousé un officier cubain, Don

⁶ Baudelaire s'est contenté d'écrire *Semper eadem*. Ce poème forme un curieux post-scriptum à la lettre du 31 août 1857. En termes polis l'ami dit à la Présidente qu'elle est incapable de comprendre les sentiments d'un homme qui s'est enivré d'un mensonge. Ce sonnet parut le 15 mai 1860, deux mois environ après l'envoi des deux lettres dont il est question dans le présent article.

Mariano Moreno, elle retourna à La Havane. Mais son mari ayant été impliqué dans une affaire de corruption, elle dut quitter une seconde fois son pays natal. Elle se rendit à Madrid, où on la trouve en 1848, suivant des cours au Conservatoire de cette ville. Son talent la signala à l'attention de la reine Isabelle qui lui octroya une pension et l'attacha à sa maison.

Ayant amassé quelque argent, la Malibran noire partit pour Paris, en 1850. Son titre de pensionnaire de la reine d'Espagne, surtout la beauté de sa voix, lui ouvrirent les salons parisiens de M. de Thorgny, du comte de Saint-Germain, du vicomte d'Arlincourt, d'Eugénie Garcia &c On organisa pour elle des concerts à la Salle Hertz, au Théâtre italien, à la Salle Pleyel. Elle fut pendant quelque temps attachée au Théâtre des Variétés Elle fit aussi une apparition à Londres en 1850, et figura dans un intermède inséré dans *I Puritani* de Bellini, joués au Théâtre de Sa Majesté.⁷

Elle se spécialisait dans les mélodies espagnoles et chantait en s'accompagnant de la guitare. Un critique de la *Revue et Gazette musicale de Paris* a décrit, comme suit, le talent de la Malibran noire: "Sa voix un peu altérée en ce moment par suite du changement de climat a plus d'expression que d'éclat; mais si le volume n'en est pas très fort, en revanche, elle se prête à la volubilité des mouvements les plus rapides, à la variété des accents joyeux ou douloureux, moqueurs ou mélancoliques. Ce n'est pas tout d'entendre la cantatrice, il faut la voir: elle est à la fois musique et spectacle."⁸

Bien qu'elle fût noire comme de l'ébène, la señora Martinez était, paraît-il, fort belle et de manières suprêmement élégantes. Un journaliste enthousiaste la compara à une Vénus florentine en bronze. Un autre rédacteur de la *Revue et Gazette musicale* a dit: "C'est quelque chose d'insolite, de bizarre, d'original, de mélancolique et de gai qui vous transporte en pensée dans un harem de l'Orient."⁹

Cette dernière phrase suggère le genre d'intérêt que Baudelaire dut concevoir pour la señora Martinez et dont la lettre non datée

⁷ La señora Martinez était introduite dans le sérail d'un Sultan, dont elle devait chasser l'ennui (idée qui dut plaire à Baudelaire s'il en eut connaissance) Un rédacteur de *The Illustrated London News* affirme qu'elle fit sensation dans ce rôle.

⁸ N° du 9 juin 1850, p. 194.

⁹ N° du 16 juin 1850, p. 198.

nous apporte le témoignage. Il l'avait sans doute entendue dans les salles de concert où elle s'était produite. Il se trouvait probablement chez Mme Sabatier le dimanche soir où Théophile Gautier l'amena chanter dans le salon de la rue Frochot¹⁰. Il faut assurément joindre la "Malibran noire" au groupe des femmes—Mme Autard de Bragard, Dorothée la Malabaraise, la négresse évoquée dans *Le Cygne*,¹¹—qui ont composé une escorte exotique à Jeanne Duval dans l'imagination de Baudelaire.

ALBERT FEUILLERAT

Yale University

A PROPOS DE "NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE EN FRANCE"

Les admirateurs américains de *La Brière*, connaissant l'enracinement plus que barrésien de son auteur Alphonse de Chateaubriant, n'iraient peut-être pas d'emblée chercher, chez cet écrivain, des traces de l'intérêt porté par la France à Nathaniel Hawthorne. Un des ouvrages récents du romancier, *La Réponse du Seigneur* (1933), porte cependant témoignage d'une influence imprévue que son quasi-homonyme le grand vicomte saluerait sans doute avec joie.

A travers la triple fiction, un peu compliquée, d'un récit jadis raconté par un mystérieux protagoniste à un premier témoin qui,

¹⁰ P. Dufay, *Autour de Baudelaire*, p. 230.

¹¹ Peut-être Baudelaire songeait-il à la señora Martinez (de race africaine, je l'ai déjà dit) quand il s'est apitoyé dans *Le Cygne* (publié le 22 janvier 1860) sur

la négresse, amaigrie et phthisique,
Piétinant dans la boue, et cherchant, l'œil hagard,
Les cocotiers absents de la superbe Afrique.

Vers la fin de 1859, Maria Martinez était si endettée que l'on saisit tous ses effets. Une ordonnance du tribunal lui restitua sa guitare, comme "instrument de travail". Ceci explique qu'elle ait dû accepter des engagements dans les cafés lyriques, ainsi que l'a rapporté Baudelaire.

Les renseignements biographiques qui précèdent ont été pris dans D. Baltazar Saldoni, *Diccionario biografico-bibliográfico de Efemérides de músicos españoles*, tomo IV, Madrid, 1881; *Revue et gazette musicale de Paris*, 9, 16 juin 1850, 4 janvier, 12 avril 1852, 1, 29 mai 1853, 12 juin, 25 décembre 1859, 5 février 1860, *L'Illustration*, 22 juin 1850, *La Ilustracion española y americana*, vol. 49, 30 mars-8 avril 1905, *The Illustrated London News*, vol. 17, 20 juillet 1850.

vieillard, en fait à son tour la relation au narrateur, des vues se font jour qui, parentes de celles de Ballanche, de Nodier, de Balzac sur la "palingénésie," incluent *The Great Stone Image* parmi leurs arguments. C'est même, au gré de Marcel Arland, "le plus haut point du livre" (*NRF*, 1er septembre 1933). Citons l'essentiel de l'anecdote qui va devenir symbolique

C'était dans un petit village perdu de la montagne, perdu au pied d'un immense rocher qui le dominait de sa masse granitique, et dans lequel avait été sculptée par la nature une gigantesque figure humaine

On disait qu'un jour, un homme d'une bonté merveilleuse, et ressemblant trait pour trait à la figure de la montagne, viendrait dans l'humble hameau exercer sa vertu et y répandre d'inoubliables bienfaits .

Or un certain petit garçon qui comme tout le monde avait appris la miraculeuse prédiction, en avait reçu dans son cœur une impression si vive, qu'il ne cessait d'y réfléchir et de tenir ses yeux levés vers la grande figure immobile. Et de plus en plus il chérissait la grande figure de pierre, en même temps que, sans en avoir conscience, il lui ressemblait graduellement

Et cela dura nombre d'années, le nombre d'années qu'il fallut pour qu'il atteignît l'âge d'homme . Jusqu'à un certain jour qu'il s'en alla par la place de village, et que ses amis et voisins, levant leurs yeux, eurent une émotion indicible, en se rendant compte que celui dont l'antique tradition prédisait la venue était au milieu d'eux (Pages 171 ss)

Or rien ne marque mieux, semble-t-il, l'interprétation faite, par la mystique contemplative du Français, de l'idéalisme social de l'Américain que ce récit lui-même et que l'ardent commentaire qui en sera fait quelques pages plus loin. mais tout "comparatiste" sait combien fécondes sont, dans l'histoire des idées, de telles "réfractions" Hawthorne attribue à son héros Ernest, pour la réalisation du mimétisme décisif de la fin, une vie active et variée. il se met en quête de la ressemblance promise en la cherchant parmi toutes sortes de professions, et "the bustle and dim of cities" ne saurait être exclus d'une telle recherche. Ici,—d'accord avec une mystique assez différente et qui se sert (comme jadis les *palingénésistes* de la chrysalide) du papillon devenu semblable à la feuille, et du chevalier du Graal modelé sur son idéal tenacement contemplé,—l'action cède le pas à la ferveur immobile :

Mais alors, qu'a-t-il fait, le petit héros de Nathaniel Hawthorne?

—Il a prié.

—Il a prié! mais vous m'avez dit seulement, monsieur, qu'il avait regardé pendant toute son enfance la figure de la montagne? En quoi a-t-il prié, faisant cela?

—C'est la même, chose prier c'est contempler, et contempler, c'est devenir
 —Contempler c'est devenir' . . . Et ainsi ce chevalier est devenu? . . Il
 était de la boue Il est devenu du soleil?
 —Exactement . . . Prier, c'est entrer dans un autre univers'

Et, plus loin encore :

. ce petit papillon a fait exactement devant la feuille, ce qu'a fait devant
 le génie de la montagne le petit héros de Nathaniel Hawthorne.

—Comment cela, monsieur?

—Qu'ils sont devenus l'un et l'autre semblables à ce qu'ils regardaient.

Cette explication me laissa tout songeur Car, à la réflexion, . . en
 effet . peut-être cela pouvait s'être passé de la façon qu'il disait
 Ce papillon était devenu semblable à ce qu'il avait regardé, tout comme
 le petit héros de la montagne . . .

Ainsi s'est précisé le double symbole. "sans vision le peuple
 périt." Ses modes d'application, dirons-nous, diffèrent chez l'écri-
 vain français et chez son prédécesseur américain mais n'est-ce point
 dans ces variations que réside la force des mythes? S'il est permis
 de me citer au sujet de la "grande image de pierre," je me rappelle
 qu'en 1913-14, achevant mon cours de Harvard sur "le type de
 l'honnête homme au XVII^e siècle," je citai l'anecdote de Haw-
 thorne pour rappeler quelle émulation animait Méré et ses zéloteurs,
 et que M. Bliss Perry me remercia d'avoir ainsi rattaché l'un à
 l'autre deux épisodes de l'histoire de la civilisation, liés en effet par
 la notion d'un mimétisme social progressif.

FERNAND BALDENSPERGER

The University of California at Los Angeles

SIR JOHN PASTON'S *GRETE BOOKE*, A FIFTEENTH- CENTURY "BEST-SELLER."

One of the most interesting items in that collection of documents
 now known as the *Paston Letters* is the bill rendered by William
 Ebesham for certain books which he had written and illuminated
 for Sir John Paston. Among the books so listed is one entitled the
Grete Booke, the contents of which are given in the bill as:¹

¹ James Gairdner, *The Paston Letters*, London and Exeter, 1904, v, 3-4
 From internal evidence, it is clear that the bill must have been written
 after 1468, probably in the following year.

First, for wrytyng of the Coronacion, and other tretys of Knyghthode, in that quaire which conteyneth a xiiij levis and more, ij ^d a lef	1js	1jd
Item, for the tietys of Weire in iiii books, which conteyneth ix levis aftir ij ^d a leaf	xs	
Item, for <i>Othea</i> pistill, which conteyneth xliij levis	vijjs	1jd
Item, for the Chalengs, and the Acts of Armes which is xxviiij th lefs	iiijjs	viijd
Item, for <i>De Regimine Principum</i> , which conteyneth xlv th levis, aftir a peny a leef, which is right wele worth	iijs	ixd
Item, for Rubrisseyng of all the booke	iijs	iijd

This is presumably the same book named in the inventory of John Paston's books under the note ²

Memorandum, my Boke of Knyghthod and the man[er] off makyng off
Knyghts, off Justs, off Tor[neaments], flyghtyng in lystys, paces holden by
so[l]diers] . and chalenges, statuts off weer and *de Regim[ine Principi-
pum]*, valet

As early as 1819, the catalogue of the Lansdowne manuscripts ³
described no. 285 as "A volume, the greatest part of which formerly
belonged to Sir John Paston, Knight, in the reign of Edw. IV. and
was copied for him by one William Ebesham, a Scribe by pro-
fession." From that day on and as recently as 1939, the identifica-
tion of the Lansdowne manuscript as the Paston *Grete Booke* has
been frequently made ⁴

It has been consistently overlooked, however, that the editor of
the *Paston Letters* himself inclined, as early as 1889, to a different
belief. Gairdner ⁵ admitted that the *Grete Booke* "certainly bore

² Gairdner, *op cit*, vi, 66 It is not certain whether the inventory refers
to John Paston the younger or to John Paston, Knight, but it must be
dated *post* 1475 as a copy of Caxton's edition of the *Game and Play of the
Chess*, printed in Bruges not before 1475, is also listed there

³ *A Catalogue of the Lansdowne Manuscripts in the British Museum*,
London, 1819, p. 99 A few years earlier, Francis Douce also referred to
'a volume once belonging to Sir John Paston, Knight, in the reign of
Edward the fourth, and now in the Lansdowne collection of MSS. in the
British Museum.' ('On the peaceable Justs, or Tiltings of the middle
ages,' *Archaeologia*, xvii (1814), 290-96)

⁴ Sir George Warner, *The Epistle of Othea to Hector*, London, The Rox-
burghe Club, 1904, p. x, n. 4; H. S. Bennett, *The Pastons and their England*,
Cambridge, 1922, p. 113, James W. Thompson, *The Medieval Library*,
Chicago, 1939, p. 409

⁵ James Gairdner, *Sailing Directions for the Circumnavigation of Eng-
land*, London, Hakluyt Society, 1889, p. 6 ff.

a wonderful resemblance to the Lansdowne volume" but the fact remained that *Lansdowne MS. 285* did not correspond exactly with Ebesham's description nor did it contain all the tracts enumerated in the bill. The editor summarized his opinion as "There is, however, another theory which, I am inclined to think, will account more satisfactorily for these discrepancies. A professional transcriber, no doubt, copied and recopied the same treatises often for various customers, and though the contents are very much the same there is nothing positively to show that the Lansdowne volume was Sir John Paston's copy of the 'Grete Booke' at all"

That the Paston *Grete Booke* was no special work but merely a copy of a common fifteenth-century "Sammelband" is proved by manuscript 775 of The Pierpont Morgan Library. Though the Morgan manuscript is well-known and has been frequently described, its similarity both to the *Grete Booke* and to *Lansdowne MS. 285* has never been adequately pointed out.⁶ The manuscript⁷ contains the following tracts.

- 1 Justus of the Pees, ff 3^r-4^v [Lansdowne MS 5-7]⁸
2. Table for measuring expenses, ff 5^r-11^v
- 3 Assize of bread and ale, ff 12^r-13^v.⁹

⁶ Compare Harold Arthur, Viscount Dillon, 'On a Manuscript Collection of Ordinances of Chivalry of the Fifteenth Century belonging to Lord Hastings,' *Archaeologia*, LVII (1900), 29-70. Lord Dillon incorrectly stated that items 2, 3 and 13 listed below were also included in *Lansdowne MS. 285*. He further claimed that the Morgan MS was copied from the Paston *Grete Booke*, on this, see note 29 below.

⁷ Compare. Albert Way, 'Illustrations of Mediaeval Manners and Costume from Original Documents,' *Archaeological Journal*, IV (1847), 226-39; Dillon, *op. cit.*, *Astley Sale Catalogue*, London, Sotheby, 1931, lot 7, *The Pierpont Morgan Library Exhibition of Illuminated Manuscripts held at The New York Public Library*, New York, 1934, pp. 47-48; *Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada*, New York, 1935-37, II, 1501-2. A number of mistakes in the *Census* and in the other works are here corrected.

⁸ References to the Lansdowne manuscript are by the numbers assigned to the tracts in the catalogue. This tract was printed by Lord Dillon, *op. cit.* Compare also *MS. Harley 69*, fol. 20, and the French text in *MS. Douce 271*, fol. 32. The text of the Lansdowne MS was printed by Douce, *op. cit.*

⁹ Printed by Dillon, *op. cit.* Compare also the text in *The Customs of London, otherwise called Arnold's Chronicle*, London, 1811, p. 49 ff.

- 4 Poem on the Coronation of Henry VI (1429), ff. 14^r-15^v and 24^r [Lansdowne MS 2] ¹⁰
- 5 The manner and form of the Coronation of Kings and Queens, ff 16^r-23^r [Lansdowne MS 1] ¹¹
- 6 De Re Militari, in English, ff 25^r-121^v [Lansdowne MS 47] ¹²
- 7 How a man schall be armyd at his ese, ff 122^v-123^v [Lansdowne MS 4] ¹³
- 8 Epistle of Thomas, Duke of Gloucester, to Richard II on tournaments, ff 124^r-130^r [Lansdowne MS 8] ¹⁴
- 9 Sailing directions, ff 131^r-138^v [Lansdowne MS 48] ¹⁵
- 10 Secreta Secretorum, in English (imperfect), ff 139^r-195^r [Lansdowne MS 54] ¹⁶
- 11 How knyghtes of the Bath schuld be made, ff 195^v-198^v [Lansdowne MS 3] ¹⁷
- 12 To make aqua composyta (later hand), f. 199^r
- 13 Epistle of Othea to Hector, in English (imperfect), ff 200^r-274^v ¹⁸
- 14 Recipe for making powder (later hand), f 275^r
- 15 Challenges of Pierre de Masse, ff 275^v-276^v [Lansdowne MS 10] ¹⁹
- 16 Challenges of Philip Boyle, ff 277^v-279^r [Lansdowne MS 9] ²⁰
- 17 Oath of a herald, ff 279^v-280^r ²¹

¹⁰ Printed by Dillon, *op cit*

¹¹ Printed by Dillon, *op cit* Compare also the MSS *Harley 6149*, fol 115^v, *Cotton Nero C IX*, fol 165, *Addit 6113*, fol 10, *Ashmole 865*, fol 245

¹² Edition by Miss K. Garvin announced by the Early English Text Society

¹³ Printed by Dillon, *op cit*, from this manuscript, and from the Lansdowne manuscript by Douce, *op cit* Compare C. J. Foulkes, *The Armourer and his Craft*, London, 1912, pp xix and 107

¹⁴ Printed by Dillon, *op cit* Compare MSS *Ashmole 856*, ff 83-93 and 383-391 and *Harley 69*, fol 26 See also W. H. Black, *Illustrations of Ancient State and Chivalry*, London, Roxburghe Club, 1840, pp 121-38

¹⁵ Printed by Gairdner, *op cit*, from the Lansdowne MS

¹⁶ Printed by Robert Steele, E. E. T. S., E. S. LXVI *Morgan MS. 775* was not known to Steele or to Carleton Brown, *A Register of Middle English Religious & Didactic Verse*, Oxford, 1916-20, no 582.

¹⁷ Printed by Dillon, *op cit* Compare MS *Cotton Nero C IX*, fol 168^v and the French text in Douce 271, fol 35 See also William Dugdale, *The Antiquities of Warwickshire*, London, 1656, p 531 ff, Alfred Byles, *Caxton's Ordre of Chyualry*, E. E. T. S., O. S. 168, pp 127-31

¹⁸ Printed by Sir George Warner for the Roxburghe Club, London, 1904, from the Longleat MS The Morgan MS was not listed by Warner or Brown, *op cit.*, no. 1703. See also note 26 below

¹⁹ Printed by Dillon, *op cit*; compare Dugdale, *op cit.*, p. 73.

²⁰ Printed by Dillon, *op cit.*; compare Dugdale, *op cit.*, p. 73.

²¹ Printed by Dillon, *op cit.*; compare MS. Douce 271, ff. 14, 22 and 60.

- 18 Weather prognostications, ff 280^v-282^v
- 19 Calendar in Latin, ff 283^r-288^v
- 20 Astrological diagrams, ff 289^v-290^v
- 21 Parvus and Magnus Cato, in Latin and English, ff 293^r-320^r ²²
- 22 Four things that make a Man a Fool, by Lydgate, f. 320^r ²³
- 23 Stanza on Deceit, by Lydgate, f 320^r ²⁴
- 24 Medical recipes (later hand), f 320^v

The Morgan manuscript, then, also bears a wonderfully close resemblance both to the Lansdowne volume and to Paston's *Grete Booke*,²⁵ though the number of leaves occupied by the important tracts common to the three manuscripts differs in each case:

²² Printed by Max Forster, *Archiv fur das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, cxv (1905), 298-323, and cxvi (1906), 27-42 Prof Forster kindly informs me that the text in the Morgan MS, which he did not use for his edition, belongs to his group β and that, though this is an inferior class of manuscript, the Morgan text is one of the better ones within this group *Morgan MS* 775 was not listed by Brown, *op cit*, nos 533 and 2533

²³ This stanza was printed by H N MacCracken, *The Minor Poems of John Lydgate*, E E T S, O S 192, II, 709, though the Morgan MS was not known to him It is also not listed by Brown, *op cit.*, no 2693.

²⁴ A single stanza from Lydgate's *Fall of Princes*, Book II, lines 4432-38 (ed by Henry Bergen, E E T S, E S cxx-cxxiv) Not listed by Brown, *op cit*, no 438

²⁵ Gairdner, *op cit*, states 'But it is singular, to say the least, that the order in which they stand in the [Lansdowne] MS is different from that of the account Moreover, the "tretys of Werre," in four books, covers not sixty leaves, but only fifty-three, and a quarter of a page more Also the treatise *De Regimine Principum* occupies, not forty-five leaves, but only forty-four, and further, there is nothing in the volume corresponding to "Othea pistill" . . . If, therefore, this MS be the "Grete Booke," referred to by Ebesham in his account, it is certain that he cited the contents in a wrong order, made two slips as to the number of leaves each article occupied, and entered one charge for a treatise not in the book at all among those which really do belong to it. Such an amount of error is scarcely conceivable in a bill so methodically drawn up, even though the writer was, as he himself says, at the time driven to live in sanctuary to escape his creditors.' The Lansdowne Catalogue furthermore claimed that certain tracts were in the handwriting of Sir John Paston; as to this, Gairdner remarks that there is no handwriting in the volume 'which bears the least resemblance either to that of the Sir John Paston who died in Edward IV's time, or to that of his brother John, who was knighted after him, in the days of Henry VII.'

	Grete Booke	Lansdowne MS	Morgan MS
<i>De Re Militari</i>	60	53	97
<i>Epistle of Othea</i>	43	— ²⁶	75+
<i>De Regimine Principum</i> ²⁷	45	44	57+
[<i>Secreta Secretorum</i>]			

It thus seems likely that Gairdner's assumption that numerous copies of the Paston *Grete Booke* were made is correct, and consequently it does *not* necessarily follow that the Lansdowne volume ²⁸ is the same as that owned by Sir John Paston. The "standard" volume, from which all three manuscripts were probably derived,²⁹ apparently contained the three longer articles noted

²⁶ As the Paston inventory notes under item 11 'a Boke de Othea,' it is possible either that the Pastons owned two copies of the *Othea* or that this work had been separated from the *Grete Booke*. If the latter be true, then the lack of the *Othea* in the Lansdowne MS is of no significance in proving that this manuscript was not the Paston *Grete Booke*. *Longleat MS 253* of this text contains 75 leaves and *St John's Cambridge MS 208* comprises 61 folios, furthermore, both these manuscripts are incomplete. It is likely therefore that none of the extant MSS of the *Othea* was the one written by William Ebesham for Sir John Paston. The present writer is preparing a new edition of this work.

²⁷ If the Lansdowne MS. is not identical with the *Grete Booke*, there is nothing to show that the Paston volume did not actually contain the Hoccleve text rather than the Lydgate-Burgh translation of the *Secreta Secretorum*. It is generally assumed that the inventory is incorrect here because the Lansdowne MS contains the Pseudo-Aristotelian tract.

²⁸ The Morgan MS may be even closer to the Lansdowne volume than the present summary indicates. In one instance certainly, the binder has misbound the sheets, for the quire containing the Coronation Ceremony is inserted into the middle of the poem on the Coronation of Henry VI. It is not unlikely that certain other tracts (particularly item 7) are now not in the position originally intended, but conclusive proof for this is not forthcoming. Nevertheless it is not impossible that some of the tracts were intended to be bound in the same order as they now stand in the Lansdowne MS. but the unusual quiring in the Morgan MS (some quires contain only a single sheet) makes it impossible to ascertain in what order the various tracts were meant to stand.

²⁹ Lord Dillon offers a different solution. He says (*op cit*, pp 31-2). 'Both MSS. [Lansdowne and Morgan] were doubtless copied from some original, now not known, but called in Sir John Paston's accounts, where the copying is noted and paid for, "The Grete boke"'. This seems most improbable, as the Morgan and Lansdowne manuscripts are contemporary in point of date, with the *Grete Booke*. The *Grete Booke*, in turn, remained in the hands of the Paston family at least till 1475 and perhaps much

above as well as a number of shorter tracts suitable for the quiet enjoyment of a knight, to this, special items were added to suit the tastes of the individual purchaser. Perhaps it may not be too rash, therefore, to suggest that these manuscripts represent an early instance of "mass-production." The books were obviously written for the landed gentry and the success which this "edition" appears to have enjoyed seems to entitle it to the distinction of being "a fifteenth-century best-seller"

CURT F. BUHLER

The Pierpont Morgan Library

ASTROLOGICAL PROGNOSTICATIONS IN MS. 775 OF THE PIERPONT MORGAN LIBRARY

Among the texts illustrating mediæval folk-lore, astrological prognostications are perhaps among the most interesting. Numerous texts of this sort, in Old English as well as in various other tongues were printed some years ago by Professor Max Forster¹ and to these may now be added the prognostications which appear in Morgan MS. 775.² The text in the Morgan MS. comprises a thunder-book, a prognostication based on the day of the week on which the moon changes and a general discussion of the influence of each planet

The first of these is clearly the most interesting. Prof. Forster divided the Old English thunder-books or *βροντολόγια* into five groups, based on the time when thunder was first heard.

longer, so that it is most unlikely that copies could have been made from it before that date. Furthermore, these two MSS. have tracts in common which do not appear to have been included in the *Grete Booke*

¹ *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, CX, 346-58, CXX, 43-52 and 296-305, CXXVIII, 285-91, with important notes. See also R. H. Robbins, "English almanacks of the fifteenth century," *Philological Quarterly*, XVIII, 321-31, and Prof. Forster's comment, *ibid*, XIX, 411-2. For further notes on the Morgan MS. see my paper "Sir John Paston's *Grete Booke*, a fifteenth-century 'best seller,'" pp. 345-51 above.

² These texts were not noted by Seymour de Ricci in his description of the manuscript in the *Census of Mediæval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada* (1935-37), II, 1501-2.

- (1) According to the month
- (2) According to the day of the week
- (3) According to the hour of the day or night
- (4) According to the canonical hour
- (5) According to the position in the heavens

A zodiacal thunder-book, to which group the Morgan text belongs, was not printed by Prof. Forster though he referred to a Slavic one in the course of his discussion. It is probable that the source for the present text may be found in the *Summa astrologiae iudicialis* by Joannes Eschuid, o1, to give his name in the English form, John of Eschenden.³ Here the text reads: ⁴

Dicit itaque hermes trimegistus libro quarto, capitulo 3 et leopoldus in libro suo tractatu sexto ⁵ *quod in quocunque signo tonuerit siue in die siue in nocte unum erit quicquid notauerit anno eodem nisi alter tonitruus in secundo signo ab eo uenerit et tunc prioris non peribunt. Si in ariete tonuerit herbae habundabunt angustia erit in filiis hominum quadrupedia multiplicabuntur. Sed bestiae agri minorabuntur. Si in tauro tonuerit annonae montium prosperabuntur et in uallibus deficiet unum et bestiae agri multiplicabuntur* ⁶ *Si in geminis pluuiarum et grandinum copia erit et fulmina legumina habundabunt lanigeræ paucae et reptilia multa.*⁷ *Si in cancro erit fames hominum et commotio locuste quoque fructus terrae uastabunt. Si in leone seditio erit inter regna annona cara in principio in fine et erit populi seditio et morietur aliquis magnus homo in fine anni. Si in uirgine ferae bestiae hominibus insidiabuntur quadrupedia morientur. Si in libra siccitas erit in ualle in principio anni deinde descendunt pluuiæ et erit annona cara in fine anni* ⁸ *Si in scorpione racemi erunt*

³ Compare Lynn Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, vol III, chap XXI, New York, 1934.

⁴ Quoted from the copy in The Pierpont Morgan Library (PML 20700), Venice, 1489, folio 145 verso.

⁵ I have not been able to locate the passage in the works of Hermes Trimegistus, though a similar passage does occur in Leopoldus, *Complatio de astrorum scientia*, "Tractatus sextus de mutatione aeris." Through the courtesy of the librarian of the College of Physicians in Philadelphia, I have been able to consult a photostatic copy of the edition printed by Erhard Ratdolt in Augsburg, 9 January 1489. As Leopoldus' text occasionally differs, his readings have in several instances been quoted in the footnotes.

⁶ In [Tauro] *annonae bona in montibus pauca in uallibus: vinum et bestiae agri multiplicabuntur.* Leopoldus.

⁷ In [Geminis] *pluuiæ erunt multe et grandines frumentum et legumen multum. aues paucae reptilia multa.* Leopoldus.

⁸ In [Libra] *siccitas in principio: in fine anni pluuiæ: et annona cara in fine.* Leopoldus.

pauci oleum uile pisces et pecudes morientur foemine abortiuos faciunt uenti magni erunt clima ab oriente obfuscabitur⁹ Si in sagietario pluuiæ erunt congruæ fructus arborum cadent serui regum praeliabuntur Si in capricorno multæ gentes dispergentur magna pestis erit in filiis hominum et mortalitas undique Si in aquario pluuiæ magnæ erunt etiam terror in hominibus uentus infrigidet tussis et scabies et commotio magna erit in saeculo Et si in piscibus tonuerit erit gelu et siccitas in terra et fructus terræ deficient unum tantum habundabit diuitiæ erunt in populo et homines infirmabuntur nec tamen morientur.¹⁰

The remaining astrological predictions are not very unusual and suitable comparisons may be made with any number of medieval treatises on astrology. A number of footnotes have been added, however, to indicate possible sources or parallels and to show where the English text is at fault.

The text printed below is found on folios 280 verso to 282 verso of Morgan MS. 775. The handwriting is of the late fifteenth century and, though carefully written, there are several omissions and slips of the pen, as may be seen by comparing the English and Latin texts.

Whenne it thundreth in Ariete that is to say whenne the Sonne is in Ariete there shall be moche gras moche desese to mon kynde shall come fowre foted beestes shullen multiplie

Whenne it thundreth in Tauro all thyng that newed in hulles shull been ese And thynges in valeys shullen faylle And wyn feld beestus shull multiplie

Whenne it thundreth in Geminis thenne there shall be moche rayne And hayll whete shall multiplie and mony wormes that crepenne shullen be

Whenne it thundreth in Cancro thenne shall be moche hungre And boturfleus shull distroye fruytus

Whenne it thundreth in Leone there shall be giete desese betwene kyn[g]-domes And dere corne in the begynnyng or in the last ende shall be desese of peple And A grete man shall deye

Whenne it thundreth in Virgine thenne it signyfeyth that Welus [sic] shullen doo desese to men And foure fotede beestes shullen deye

Whenne it thundreth in Libra thenne there shall be drowth in the valeyes and in the ende of the yere shall be moche reyne And cornes shal be full dere in the ende &

Whenne it thundreth [in] Scorpione thenne there shall be lytyll Oyll and ffysshes of the See shullen deye and beestes Wommen shall haue many dede

⁹ In [Scorpione] racemi pauci pisces et pecudes morientur femine abortient· venti erunt magni [Luna] in oriente obscurabitur Leupoldus

¹⁰ In [Piscibus] gelu et siccitas in terra fructus terre deficient vinum multum abundabit diuitie erunt homines infirmabuntur non tamen multi morientur Leupoldus

chi[l]dren within here body there shullen be grete wyndes there shall be a merkenes in the Mone in the Est parte of the firmament

Whenne it thundreth in Capricornu thenne shall moche peple be disperged and grete pestilence in children of men And grete pestylence [in] all the world

Whenne it thundieth in Sagittari thenne reynes shullen be but euene fruytus of treus shullen falle and kynges shullen zeuenne batayllus

Whenne it thundreth in Aquario thenne shullen be grete raynes and grete drede of peple the wynd shall engendur the couz and the scabbe and grete stryfe shall be in the world

Whenne it thundreth in Pissibus thenne shall be grete forstes and dryenes in the eyre ffrutus on erth shull fayll wyne shall multiplye moche rychesse shall be amonge the peple many A man shall be seke but they shull not deye

In what signe þat eyr it thundreth whether it by day or be nyght as it is notified it shall be soth but so be that it thundyr in þe next signe aftur thenne the thunder of the furst leseth his strenght And the seconde thunder holdeth his strength and it farith in eche signe

If the mone chaunge on Soneday hit signifieth drye wether fro the furst day tyll the xxxth day

If it chaunge on Monday it signifieth weþer drye ne wete

If it chaunge on the Tywysday it signifieth cold weþer And northen wynde

If it chaunge on the Wendysday it signifieth wete wethurs

If it chaunge on the Thursday [sic] it signifieth bryzt weþer and clere

If it chaunge on þe ffryday hit signifieth medlyd weþer drye and rayne

If he chaunge on the Seturday hit signifieth rayne weþer

This rewel faylleth not moche if it be well taken in his chaunge tr[e]wlyche¹¹

Ye shullen vnderstande there be planettes

Saturnus Iubiter Mars Sol Venus Mercurius Luna

The planet of Saturne is cold and drye and shrewed And whenne he regneth he maketh all maner of Tempast he maketh A man hevy and zelowe of complexions And mony other thynges¹²

¹¹ A similar prognostication may be found in *Batman vppon Bartholome, His Booke, De Proprietatibus Rerum* (London, 1582) in the chapter entitled "De Neomenia," folio 150 recto. Here it reads. "Also of the Prime the common rule is, that Sunday Prime is dry weather, Munday prime wet, Teusday prime, cold and windie, Wednesdaye tempestuous, Thursday faire and cleere, Friday changeable, Saterdag raine, the three dayes from the chaunge, is the prime day" See also the early English version in MS. Cotton Tiberius A III, f. 38^v.

¹² Bartholomaeus Anglicus says that Saturn has "two dedely qualytees coldnesse & drynesse." He also says that Saturn "makyth a man broun & fowle, mysdoynge, slowe & heuy, eleyng & sory, seldom gladde & mery

Jubiter he is hote and moyst and he is good to all thynges And he doth none harme to man he maketh A man good and honest and of wyn colour and he bryngeth all clere wethur and all goodnus

Mars is cold and drye and shrewed he maketh a man croked and wrathfull and malicious And whanne he regneth he signifieth batel and fal-hed¹³

Sol that is the Sonne he is hoot and drye and temporat he maketh erbes and trews to growe and bere fryzt he maketh A man to be full of flessh and fayr and manerly of other th[ing]es

Venus that is day-sterie he is hote and moyst and Sangwyn he maketh A man to be whyte colour redy glad and lecherus he loveth all goodnus¹⁴

Mercurius [sic] he is cold and drye his vertue is with good he is good with euyl he maketh A man wyse and many other dyuerse goodnesse he cordeth with all the planettes¹⁵

Luna he [is] cold and moyst for whv by the Mone we haue encrease and decrease he maketh A man to be mevable neuer to dwell in oon place he maketh a man to haue his on hande ay more thenne his other his on fote more thenne his other or any other lymme

Of these planettes there is a table¹⁶ to knowe every day whanne any of hem regneth And thus I suppose that this day be called Thursday that is to say Jubiter atte the Sonne ry-nyng that same planet that day is cold aftur reigne [sic] And next aftur hym next houre regneth Mars And the next houre aftur hym regneth Sol And aftur hym regneth Venus And aftur hym the next houre regneth Marcurie And aftur hym the next that is the sixte oure regneth Luna And aftur hym the next oure regneth Saturnus And aftur hym regneth Jubiter And so eueryche oure tyl þou come to 24 oures every planet regneth aftur odur

CURT F. BUHLER

The Pierpont Morgan Library

other laughyng And therefore Pholomeus [sic] sayth thev þat ben subgette to Saturnus haue oft euyl drye chynnes in the hynder party of the fote. And ben yelow of colour & broun of heere & sharpe in al the body and vnsemely" *De Proprietatibus Rerum*, Westminster, Wynkyn de Worde, 1495, Lib VIII, cap XIj

¹³ "Mars est planeta calidus et siccus." Albohazen Haly, *Liber in iudiciis astrorum*, Venice, Ratdolt, 1485, f 4r

¹⁴ "Venus est frigida et humida," Albohazen Haly, *op cit*, f 5 "Venus est frigida humida et temperata," Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum naturale*, Strassburg, R-Printer, 1473, Lib XVI, cap xlv.

¹⁵ "Mercurius est calidus et siccus," Vincent of Beauvais, *op cit*

¹⁶ A manuscript table of this sort in French is written on the title-page of the copy of Leupoldus in the library of the College of Physicians in Philadelphia It is drawn up for every day of the week A table drawn up only for Sunday may be found in Albumasar, *Introductorium in astronomiam*, Augsburg, Ratdolt, 1489, signature g4 verso.

HYGD

Queen Hygd, the wife of King Hygelac of the Geatas, is thrice mentioned in *Beowulf*. Her name first appears in the description of the Geatish court which the poet gives in lines 1925 ff.

- 1925 Bold wæs beþlic, bregorof cyning,
 hea, healle, Hygd swiðe geong,
 wis, welþungen þeah ðe wintra lyt
 under burhlocan gebiden hæbbe,
 Hæreþes dohtor, næs hio hnah swa þeah,
 1930 ne to gneað gifa Geata leodum,
 maþmgestieona mod þryðo wæg,
 fremu folces ewen, firen ondrysne

'The building was grand, the king renowned, high, the hall even so, Hygd very young, wise, virtuous. Though she may have spent only a few years at court, the daughter of Hæreth, nevertheless she was not ungenerous, nor too sparing of gifts and treasure to the men of the Geatas: the good folk-queen had weighed the arrogance and terrible wickedness of Thryth.'

The passage offers certain difficulties of interpretation. I take *healle* 1926 to be a dative of accompaniment. *king with hall* means *king and hall*, each is said to be high.¹ Alternatively, *healle* may be taken with *bold*; such a dative construction seems strange to modern feeling, which would prefer a simple appositive, but it is not unknown in *Beowulf*.² The phrase *under burhlocan* need not be taken literally, like *in gearðum*, it may mean simply 'in the world' or 'on earth.' If so, the clause *þeah . . . hæbbe* means 'young though she may have been.' On the other hand, *under burhlocan* makes excellent sense if taken literally. We must then suppose that Hygd was not only young (1926b) but also inexperienced in court life and courtly ways. Whatever the interpretation of *under burhlocan*, the poet goes on to tell us that Hygd rose to the situation. Her treatment of the retainers was just what it should be, and the rightness of her conduct seems to be attributed to her wisdom, for the poet represents her as weighing the conduct of Thryth. He does not add in so many words that she rejected Thryth as a model of behavior, but the necessary implication is that she not only weighed Thryth but also found her wanting.

¹ The scansion of the half-line may be compared to that of 947a and the like, cf. J. Hoops, *Beowulfstudien* (Heidelberg, 1932), p. 11.

² See my paper in *Anglia* LVII (1933), 313 ff.

More particularly, Hygd did not treat the retainers with the harshness characteristic of Thryth, but was kind to them.

The intellectual (or at least reflective) twist which the poet gives to Hygd's behavior was in all likelihood inspired by the queen's name, which means 'mind, thought, reflexion, forethought.' And it was the same inspiration which led him to contrast Hygd with Thryth, whose name means 'strength, might, power, force.'³ The two ladies indeed stand at opposite poles, as the *Beowulf* poet presents them. The moderate, reasonable, reflective Hygd wins favor with all, while the reckless, impulsive, cruel Thryth brings down upon herself general condemnation, in spite of her beauty and magnetic personality. The presumably historical characters, the wife of Hygelac and the wife of Offa, hardly made such a contrast in real life. We have no means of knowing what they were actually like, but it is a safe presumption that their names contributed largely to the development of their characters and careers in story (as distinguished from history). This is not the place to investigate the tale of Thryth. The *Beowulf* poet's first reference to Hygd (considered above) gives us some idea of Hygelac's wife as a character in heroic story. We get further information about her later on. According to lines 2172 ff, Beowulf upon his return from Denmark gave to Hygd the collar which the Danish queen had given to him, he also gave three saddle-horses to Hygd. These gifts hardly have much significance for our present purpose, they represent a conventional or customary procedure, and it would be hazardous to read into them anything personal, even though the poet takes the trouble to tell us that Hygd wore the collar afterwards. The last passage in which Hygd is mentioned, however, adds something to our picture of her. Hygelac lost his life in the Low Countries, and Beowulf went back to the land of the Geatas as sole survivor of the ill-fated expedition. Upon his arrival, we are told,

³ The contrary theory, according to which Hygd's name was an invention of the English poet, has little to commend it. The name element *hugd* was actually used in Old Germanic name-giving, see M. Schonfeld, *Wb der altgerm. Personen- und Volkernamen* (Heidelberg, 1911), p. 142, with the references there given, and see especially S. Gutenbrunner, *Die germ. Gotternamen der antiken Inschriften* (Halle, 1936), p. 78. Moreover, Hygd's name alliterates with her father's. We have good reason, then, to think that Hygelac's wife was actually named Hygd.

- 2369 þær him Hygd gebead hord ond rice,
 beagas ond bregostol bearne ne truwode
 þæt he wið ælfylcum eþelstolas
 2372 healdan cuðe, ða wæs Hygelac dead

Here the poet represents Hygd as having in her hands the bestowal of the Geatish throne. Such a state of things presupposes a woman of unchallenged authority, and such authority could hardly be hers simply as the widow of the king. Personal competence and a devoted following would seem to be necessary implications here. Moreover, Hygd lives up to her name when she offers the crown to Beowulf. Her reason for making him this offer is instructive. She considers her son Heardred incompetent to maintain the kingdom against attack from abroad. This calculating, coldblooded decision is worthy of the name *Hygd*. Beowulf is represented as refusing the offer, out of loyalty to Hygelac's memory, he consents only to serve as regent until Heardred has become older. Whether the offer of the kingdom was ever made, in point of fact, need not concern us. We are interested primarily in the character of Hygd, as developed by the poet, and the trait under discussion makes it manifest that the Geatish queen is consistently characterized in terms of her name.

KEMP MALONE

The Johns Hopkins University

A RESTORED READING IN THE TOWNELEY PURIFICATION PLAY

Mr. George England in the Early English Text Society's edition of *The Towneley Plays* has claimed that the rubric on page 185, following line 132 of the Purification Play, is illegible in its final part. He properly reads the first portion, *Angeli cantant, simeon*. . . . Professor Frampton in his articles upon the shortcomings of the E. E. T. S. edition has allowed Mr. England's statement to stand uncontested;¹ and so far as I know, no reading has heretofore been proposed.

The words in question are admittedly indistinct; yet from a photostat of the manuscript I believe they are not absolutely

¹ Mendal G. Frampton, "The Early English Text Society Edition of the Towneley Plays," *Beiblatt zur Anglia*, XLVIII, 330-333, 366-368, XLIX, 3-7

illegible, and that the full rubric is to be read, *Angeli cantant. Simeon iustus & timoratus*. Of the final word the photostat shows an *at* plus a flourished *us* at the end, legible enough. The scribe's symbol for & is also evident, and his flourish for the final *us* of the word I take to be *iustus*. The long interior *s* and the top of the *t* which follows it seem also evident in this word. Before this long *s* three short heavy vertical strokes remain visible which might be read as *u*, my reading, or *in*, or just possibly, *m*. In the word I read as *timoratus* the initial *t* is I think sufficiently legible, and probably the *i* which follows. The *mor* appears to be badly rubbed; yet there is nothing visible which does not coincide with the reading I propose. The long stroke below the line of the *r* is still clear. Incidentally, the *S* of Simeon is wrongly transcribed in the E E T. S. edition as minuscule. In the manuscript it is properly majuscule. This is the evidence from the photostat itself. The drawing shows what I find in it, as well what I believe to have been the original condition of the script. The first line gives what the photostat shows, the second my restoration of the so-called illegible portion.

Angeli cantant Simeon iustus & timoratus

iustus & timoratus

Evidence corroborating my reading lies in the fact that *Simeon iustus et timoratus* is the incipit of the first antiphon of Lauds for the Feast of the Purification in the Roman Breviary. This antiphon was also used in times prior to the date of the Towneley manuscript as its occurrences in the *Hereford Breviary*, II, 104, and the *Ordinale Exon.*, I, 212, clearly show

The English texts of the cycle plays, moreover, often echo the Latin rubrics which they include. The case before us is but another instance of this custom, as line 133, "Thou, symeon, rightwys and trew," immediately following the rubric is a paraphrase of the Latin. The lines which follow it also paraphrase a portion of the

antiphon not included in the incipit. I append the full antiphon and, for comparison, the pertinent lines of the Towneley play.

Antiphon Simeon justus et timoratus expectabat redemptionem Israel, et Spiritus Sanctus erat in eo

primus angelus Thou, symeon, rightwys and tiew,
Thou has desyred both old and new,
To haue a sight of cryst ihesu
As prophecy has told¹

EDWARD MURRAY CLARK

University of Oklahoma

LILBURNE'S NOTE ON MILTON

Students of Milton's social ideas have long sought to clarify Milton's relationship with the leaders of the Leveller movement, Lilburne, Overton, and Walwyn. That Milton knew Overton appears probable from the close correlation between Milton's ideas of mortality as explained in *De Doctrina* and those of Overton's *Man's Mortallitie* (1644).¹ Milton was possibly Overton's collaborator in the 1655 edition of this pamphlet.² On March 26, 1649, Milton was ordered by the Council of State to "make some observations" on *England's New Chains Discovered* (Second Part),³ which was the second Leveller denunciation of Cromwell and his officers as the new tyrants. On March 28, he was ordered to "make some observations on the complication of interests which is now amongst the several designers against the peace of the Commonwealth."⁴ The "several designers" certainly included the Leveller leaders, of whom Cromwell had said, on March 26, "I tell you, Sir, you have no other way to deal with these men but to break them to pieces."⁵ In spite of these two injunctions Milton wrote nothing against the Levellers; this circumstance alone is highly indicative either of his friendship for them as people or his conviction that Cromwell was unjust in sloughing off those extreme democratic segments of Commonwealth support upon which he had counted to help carry the Independents to power. It was left to John Canne to write

¹ Saurat, *Milton Man and Thinker*, pp. 312-20.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 320-26.

³ Masson, IV, 87.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, IV, 47.

the anti-Leveller blast, *The Discoverer*; and the authors of that skilful pamphlet, *Walwyns Wiles*, attempted to destroy Walwyn's reputation among the liberal churchmen of London, all supporters of the Independents. Though the official Commonwealth spokesman, Milton refused to use his talents against the radicals. In his tracts there is no mention either of the Leveller movement or of its leaders. The only direct reference to their tenets is in *Defensio Secunda*. Milton was no believer in manhood suffrage, a principal plank in the Leveller platform:

For who would vindicate your right of unrestrained suffrage, or of choosing what representatives you liked best whoever they might be, or him, however small might be his worth, who would give you the most lavish feasts, or enable you to drink to the greatest excess? Thus not wisdom and authority, but turbulence and gluttony, would soon exalt the vilest miscreants from our taverns and our brothels to the rank and dignity of senators *

About Milton the Levellers before 1652 were peculiarly silent. In Overton's tracts appears no mention of Milton that any one has yet discovered, nor in Walwyn's. Even in 1649, when the final break between Leveller and Independent resulted in the crushing of the Leveller movement, the Levellers gave no indication of their attitude toward the Commonwealth's literary champion. Lilburne at first thought *The Discoverer* might have been written by Gualter Frost, Milton's assistant. He later condemned the real author, John Canne, as an apostate. In reply to *Walwyns Wiles* Walwyn showed his utter disillusionment with John Price, former Leveller supporter, and his disappointment with John Goodwin, leading Independent pastor and friend of Milton's. But there is no mention of Milton himself, whose *Tenure* and *Erkonoklastes* had claimed for the new Commonwealth exemplification of the Levellers' democratic principles. The Levellers had every reason to

* *Prose Works* (Bohn), I, 297. Milton's notion that wicked men would elect wicked men to office was in complete contrast to the position of Overton, who saw no relationship whatever between personal sinning and enlightened social action (*A Picture of the Council of State*, 1649, p. 44). "The business is, not how great a sinner I am, but how faithfull and reall to the Commonwealth, that's the matter that concerneth my neighbor. for my personal sins that are not of civill cognizance or wrong unto him . . . leave them to God, whose judgment is righteous and just."

attack the *Tenure* as pseudo-democratic doctrine which the Grandee Independents had no intention of putting into practice

Lilburne's note on Milton in *As You Were* (1652), a passage which has hitherto escaped the notice of scholars, is particularly important, then, as the only evidence thus far uncovered that illuminates the Leveller attitude toward the increasingly famous Latin secretary. It is a surprisingly favorable appraisal of the last lines of Milton's *Defence*, which carry Milton's warning to the English people that the aims of the new Commonwealth yet remain largely unrealized

Therefore as a man that intirely loves my native Country I shall request you to commend unto the serious and hearty consideration of the LORD GENERALL and his Confederates the Advice of their valiant and learned Champion Mr MILTON, who haveing much spent his eloquence to rout the forces of SALMASIUS, in the Epilogue his Latin booke, „called a *Defense of the People of England*„, turnes his speech to his Masters that had set him on worke, whom he with much *faithfullnes* and Freedome bespeakes on this manner „One thing is remaineing and that haply of the greatest moment, that you o my Countrymen and Fellow-Cityzens should your owne selves undertake the refutation of this your adversary and that you shall in a short time find God more incensed with wrath against you, then ever yet your enemies have found him averse or you have felt him benigne, favourable and fatherly-affected unto you, more then to all the Nations at this time inhabiting the face of the whole earth and soe far for Mr *Miltons* excellent and faithfull advice to them⁷

This passage shows Lilburne's high regard for Milton. He thinks of Milton as a courageous, frank critic of the Commonwealth, not an unquestioning adherent of the "Masters that had set him on worke." He has read the *Defence* sympathetically, with respect for Milton's learning and eloquence. Whatever may be said of Lilburne's unreasonable combativeness, he was by common consent of his enemies an incorruptible patriot, undaunted by his most powerful enemies. Even though he knew that Milton was no democrat, Lilburne's praise was undoubtedly sincere. What may have affected Lilburne's attitude was Milton's uncompromising stand for toleration. Like Milton, the Levellers were more extreme tolerationists than the leading Independents; they had broken with Cromwell and Ireton on this issue in December, 1648, when the

⁷ *As You Were*, pp 15-16. The extra commas that appear in the passage are Lilburne's insertions. Only a portion of the long Milton passage used by Lilburne is quoted here

Agreement of the People was under discussion. Though Milton did not praise the Levellers, he knew them to be undaunted advocates of the religious freedom he held most dear. We are now certain that their regard for Milton had survived his support of their bitter enemies. From the pen of the most severe and uncompromising of the democratic critics, this praise of Milton is indication of a closer ideological and perhaps personal bond with the Levellers than scholars have hitherto assumed.

DON M. WOLFE

Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute

IZAAK WALTON A STATIONER?

Some new information indicates that during the Interregnum Izaak Walton may have operated a shop dealing in stationers' or booksellers' stores. If he did, the fact is interesting, for all of Walton's life is rather shadowy, no period more than this. Moreover, while various occupations have been ascribed to him,¹ that of a stationer has not heretofore been suggested. Unfortunately, whether it was he or some other Walton is yet impossible to say.

The new information is contained in the records of the Parliamentary Committee for Compounding with Delinquents, in the Public Record Office. According to an entry therein, on April 13, 1652, Dr. Nathaniel Holmes, lessee of a sequestered house of Bishop Henry King's, petitioned the Committee for help:

to maintaine my passage or doorway into the sayd house agaynst Walton, who dammeth it up in great part, with huge reames of brown paper, and paper bookes, giving out as I am informed that I shall not have way there, unlesse he please.²

Walton's first name is never given. The house in question—"Curlew House," "near the west end of Paul's"—had been settled by Bishop King on his second son, Henry. Sequestered once, it had been restored because the son was not a delinquent. On February 12, 1651/2, however, the Committee, deeming that it

¹ See Arthur M. Coon, "Izaak Walton's Residence and Occupation," *Notes and Queries*, 176, No. 7 (February 18, 1939), 110-12.

² Public Record Office, S P 23 89/1021

should not have been restored, rented it for £18 to Dr. Holmes³ (no doubt the Puritan divine and millenarian)⁴ This was £10 below its normal rent, partly because the house had been standing empty and its walls had been broken down Dr Holmes specifically complained of "new quirkes from other houses let down into the yaid, with breaking of casements and windowes to peeces"⁵ But even £18 proved too high a rent for profit On receipt of Dr. Holmes's petition, the Committee ordered Walton either to cease blocking the passage or to appear and explain.⁶ Apparently he did neither, for three weeks later Dr Holmes complained that, his former grievance not being redressed, William Legate had been emboldened by Walton to "open a door in the foreyard of the house, pretending that it is his."⁷ Dr Holmes now asked for examination of the titles of Legate and Walton, and the Committee summoned both offenders⁸ Thereafter Walton's name ceased to appear in the entries for a time, although he perhaps continued to collaborate with Legate. The latter, at least, persisted in his courses with such success that Dr Holmes was unable to get a tenant for the rest of 1652 On January 7, 1652/3, Walton was again summoned on a renewed complaint of blocking the premises.⁹ Finally, seven months later, Dr Holmes apparently having been prevented by Legate and Walton from making any money on his bargain during the year and a half he was lessee, Curlew House was restored to the Kings, August 10, 1653.¹⁰

Izaak Walton, as we know, had given up his draper's business and moved from Chancery Lane in 1644; yet he remained in London at least ten years more¹¹ What was he doing? Writing, we know. But that would not have sufficiently occupied the time and energy of so industrious a man as he seems to have been. Moreover, it would not have brought in much money In fact he specifically mentions that he did not write the *Compleat Angler* for money.¹² Yet certainly his clerical friends of whom Anthony à Wood writes¹³ were in no position to support him and his family

³ *Ibid.*, 23 16/9.

⁴ *DNB*, xxvii, 193.

⁵ P R O., S P 23 89/1031

⁶ *Ibid.*, 16/143.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 89/1029

⁸ *Ibid.*, 89/1029

⁹ *Ibid.*, 17/581

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 18/863

¹¹ See Arthur M. Coon, *The Life of Izaak Walton*, unpublished Cornell University Ph.D. Thesis, 1938, pp. 124-25, 153 ff.

¹² In the "Epistle to the Reader," all editions.

¹³ *Athenae Oxonienses*, 1691, I, 265.

in these years Had he then laid by sufficient money for retirement by 1644? Or did he perhaps receive a large dowry when, in 1647, he married Anne Ken?¹⁴ Possibly, yet he might well have engaged in some new business. That of a stationer, or seller of booksellers' or printers' supplies, would have required no special training, and he had many friends among booksellers and printers who could have helped him get into and continue in the business. As a matter of fact he held the lease on a house and shop in Paternoster Row, the heart of the booksellers' district, as early as 1662, and very likely earlier.¹⁵ Moreover, Paternoster Row is the next street to St. Paul's Churchyard, and the square is a narrow one, so that the lessee of property on one street might conceivably block the doorway or passage of property on the other. Finally, Izaak Walton would very naturally have acted just this way toward any enemy of the Kings,¹⁶ for he and Bishop Henry King were great friends. The best evidence of their friendship is a letter of 1664 from King which may glance at the very situation we have been discussing. It begins:

Honest Izaak

Though a Familiarity of more than Forty years continuance, and the constant experience of your Love even in the worst of the late sad times, be sufficient to endear our Friendship.

and concludes.

Your ever-faithful and affectionate old Friend,

Henry Chichester¹⁷

It is curious, incidentally, that in 1638 the tenant next to William Legate in St. Paul's Churchyard (possibly the tenant of Curlew House) was Robert Roe¹⁸—curious, because Izaak Walton had a good friend named Robert Roe.¹⁹

¹⁴ He certainly received some dowry. See Coon, *Life of Walton*, p. 171.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 273-74. I say very likely earlier because he was not in London much after 1655.

¹⁶ Though mild, he was not spineless; Charles Cotton says "he will be seen twice in no man's company he does not like, and likes none but such as he believes to be very honest men" (*Compleat Angler*, ed. Nicolas, 1875, p. 225).

¹⁷ *The Compleat Walton*, ed. Keynes, 1929, pp. 209-12.

¹⁸ Lambeth MS. 272, ed. T. C. Dale under title *The Inhabitants of London in 1638* (London, 1931), p. 66.

¹⁹ The "Epistle to the Reader" of the *Compleat Angler* mentions the

There is, however, no certainty that this Walton was Izaak. It may well be objected, for instance, that there were other Waltons in London. An appraisement roll of 1638 mentions seven others.²⁰ But it is hard to dismiss as coincidences so many points of resemblance between the Walton of the doorway and Izaak Walton especially the associations with printers, with property near Curlew House, with Robert Roe, and with the Kings. If this Walton was not Izaak, at least we have netted some close relative of his. As a matter of fact, we know of a Henry Walton who may have been a relative, and who might have been the Walton concerned in the Curlew House dispute. He was residuary legatee and sole executor of the will of Samuel Walton, of St Mary's Cray, Kent (proved April 9, 1631), and is called a cousin of the deceased, "of White-chapel, citizen and haberdasher"²¹. These Waltons, too, were connected with the Kings, for Samuel Walton left bequests to his "brother-in-law, Henry King" [later, presumably, the Bishop], and to John King. Moreover, a Henry Walton—perhaps the same man, and very probably connected with Izaak—had a child of his baptised "Izaacke" at St Martin's Church, Ironmonger Lane, October 17, 1619.²²

Further research into the whole matter is needed, but that is of course impossible while the war continues. All we appear to be warranted in saying now is that Izaak Walton (or perhaps Henry Walton, a relative of whom little has heretofore been known) may have dealt in printers' stores about 1652.

ARTHUR M. COON

Beloit College

JOHN DONNE'S "BRACELET OF BRIGHT HAIR ABOUT THE BONE"

In his poems John Donne has twice used an expression so memorable that it has become associated with him—almost a symbol of his poetry. In one poem he speaks of "that subtle wreath of

happy times when Walton went fishing with "honest Nat and R. Roe" Information in my possession indicates that the *R* stood for *Robert*

²⁰ Dale, *op cit*, *passim*.

²¹ *The Compleat Angler*, ed Nicolas, 1875, p. clv

²² *Notes and Queries*, 4th Series, xii (November 15, 1873), 383.

haire, which crowns my arme", in another one he uses the phrase "a bracelet of bright hane about the bone" Since Donne's poems were published in a loose grouping after his death it is almost impossible to date the two poems, *The Funerall* and *The Relique*, in which these expressions occur. Dates are, however, of no particular importance, if the reader will accept the primary premise of this paper—that both the expressions are the product of a single obsession in the mind of Donne or of a single source outside it.

Here, I believe, is the raw material that Donne transformed in his alembic Giraldus Cambrensis in his *Speculum Ecclesiae*¹ has described the search made for the bones of Arthur in the time of Henry II, the discovery of them, and their removal to the cathedral at Glastonbury. I offer here in translation only the pertinent lines. Within an oak coffin are discovered the heaped bones of Arthur and Guinevere. Tangled amongst the bones is "tricam muliebram flavam et formosam, miroque consortam" (a tress of woman's hair of a beautiful tawny hue, marvelously intertwined). In a briefer and later account in *De Principis Instructione*² Giraldus also mentions the exhumation, and there in different words he again refers to the lock of hair which was snatched up by a greedy monk and reduced to dust. "Trica comae muliebris flava cum integritate pristina et colore reperta fuit." (There was found a tress of woman's hair still fresh and fair in color and texture.)

The likeness between these accounts and the expressions in the poems is obvious. The manuscripts containing these accounts were in Robert Cotton's library,³ to which Donne had apparently ready access. A letter written by Donne from the prison into which he was cast on his marriage to Ann More thanks Robert Cotton for the loan of a book,⁴ and one written from Pyrford in 1603 to Cotton is evidently part of a linked correspondence.⁵ It is simple enough, then, to prove that Donne had the chance to read the *Speculum Ecclesiae*; it is very difficult indeed to show that it was probable that he read it. I offer this as the most plausible sequence of events that led Donne to the passage.

Donne was more than a casual visitor to Cotton's library; he was

¹ *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera*, Vol. IV (Rolls Series)

² *Ibid.*, Vol. VIII (Rolls Series)

³ *Speculum Ecclesiae*, Cotton MS. Tiberius, Bxiii; *De Principis Instructione*, Cotton MS. Julius, Bxiii.

⁴ Edmund Gosse, *Life and Letters of John Donne* (1899), I, 108.

⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 123-124.

an intimate of the circle that included Cotton. In 1615 Tom Coryat sent from Agra a letter "addressed to about twenty-five friends in England, members of 'the Right Worshipful Fraternity of Sirenicall Gentlemen that meet the first Friday of every month, at the sign of the Mermaid in Broad Street in London'"⁶ Both Robert Cotton and John Donne are included in this company. If Donne moved in this company, he must have known William Camden, Cotton's antiquarian friend, who sought out Cotton to make use of his manuscripts for his study of the past. Camden had obviously consulted Giraldus Cambrensis and in his *Britannia* (1586) had sketched briefly the scene of the exhumation of Arthur, though, curiously enough, he had not included the bit about the hair. Now it is certainly more plausible to assume that the young Donne came to the obscure manuscript of Giraldus by way of the *Britannia* than through undirected search. The young Donne would have read a book deservedly popular in his day; his notoriously morbid imagination would have picked out the exhumation scene and carried it in his mind. It is not too rash to assume that a curious Donne later asked Camden for his source—and thus came on the material for his alchemy.

PHILLIPS D. CARLETON

University of Vermont

A MISDATING OF "A BALLADE UPON A WEDDING"

The *NED* in glossing "course-a-park" quotes, naturally enough, the lines from Sir John Suckling's well-known poem, "A Ballade Upon a Wedding": "At course-a-park, without all doubt, / He should have first been taken out", but the quotation, instead of being attributed to Suckling, is given on the authority of the miscellany, *Wits Recreations*, and dated 1640. To trust the dictionary's dating would lead one to believe that Suckling's poem had first appeared in print during its author's lifetime instead of posthumously in the *Fragmenta Aurea* of 1646, as has always been supposed. One would also have to disbelieve the tradition that the poem was written in honor of the wedding of Lord Broghill and Lady Margaret Howard, which took place on January 27, 1641;¹ for the colophon of *Wits Recreations* (sig. Cc8^v) dates the

⁶ *Ibid.*, I, 275-276.

¹ See *The Dramatic Works Of Roger Boyle Earl Of Orrery*, ed. W. S. Clark (Cambridge, Mass., 1937), I, 11

book October 8, 1639. Suckling's last scholarly editor, A Hamilton Thompson, accepted the date of the poem as given by the *NED* and, unwilling to give up the tradition of the poem's celebrating the wedding, concluded the book was dated old style.² The colophon of course shows this to be impossible.

Had the maker of the slip for the dictionary or Mr. Thompson examined the 1640 edition of *Wits Recreations*, he would have searched in vain for Suckling's ballad. The book contains 503 numbered brief poems or epigrams and 126 numbered epitaphs, as well as "A Thousand outLandish Proverbs." by Mr. G. H., who is none other than George Herbert. The second edition of the book, dated 1641, adds some epigrams and epitaphs but omits the proverbs, printing in their place a section entitled, "Fancies And Fantastickes." In this section in the fourth edition (1650), which goes under the name *Recreation For Ingenious Head-peeeces*, "A Ballade" was printed,³ but it was not attributed to Suckling. It was reprinted in the editions of 1654, 1663, and 1667. We must conclude therefore that to the *Fragmenta Aurea* of 1646 still belongs the honor of first printing Suckling's finest poem, and there is nothing in this date to disturb our belief that the poem celebrates the wedding of Lord Broghill and Lady Margaret.

The source of the misconception in the *NED* is instructive. In the second edition of Robert Nares' *Glossary* (1859),⁴ the maker of the slip for the dictionary found the term "course-a-park" illustrated by stanza four of "A Ballade," which was attributed to *Witts* [*sic*] *Recreations*, but not to Suckling. Not recognizing it as Suckling's work, he looked up the date of the first edition of *Wits Recreations* and found it to be 1640, but he did not look at the book. The edition he used, as the bibliography of the *NED* reveals, was that of 1663, which is very different from that of 1640.

CARL NIEMEYER

Herzl Junior College
Chicago, Illinois

² *The Works Of Sir John Suckling In Prose And Verse*, ed A Hamilton Thompson (1910), p 370.

³ Sigg Z_{sv} to Z_{sv} . (I am indebted to Mr James G McManaway, who kindly looked up the poem for me in the Folger Library copy of the fourth edition)

⁴ I, 197.

THE JONSONIAN TRADITION IN THE COMEDIES OF JOHN DENNIS

Ben Jonson claims the attention of scholars for various reasons, not the least of which, perhaps, is the fact that he popularized the comedy of humours. That this type of comedy persisted, with modifications, during the Restoration period has often been pointed out in connection with Thomas Shadwell, John Wilson, Abiahham Cowley, Sir Robert Howard, William Cavendish, and other dramatists of the age. An examination of the comedies written by John Dennis provides another link in the chain of evidence connecting Jonson and the Restoration.¹

In the preface (Advertisement to the Reader) to his first comedy, *A Plot and No Plot, or Jacobite Cruelty* (1697), Dennis points with pride to his observance of the unities, especially those of time and action.² One of the characters in the play mentions the realistic and satirical nature of the comedy.³ Like Jonson, Dennis uses a pair of intriguers to direct the action,⁴ and he presents "humour" characters similar in some respects to those of Jonson's comedies.⁵ The plot of Dennis' play, too, generally resembles that of the

¹ H. G. Paul has noted Dennis' approval of Jonson's theories in *John Dennis: His Life and Criticism* (New York, 1911), pp. 170, 188-9, and E. N. Hooker, in *The Critical Works of John Dennis* (Baltimore, 1939), I, 495, has pointed out that, although Dennis was not blind to Jonson's faults, "Throughout his criticism Dennis praised Jonson as one of the best comic poets of the world." Neither of these two authorities, however, has shown that in actual practice Dennis continued the Jonsonian tradition.

² Hooker, *Critical Works*, I, 245. Cf. Jonson's statement in the prologue to *Volpone*.

³ "Belvil. . . is not this seen every day in the world? Are not more discerning people than my unkle drawn daily into the grossest snares upon the like occasions? The showing of which would therefore be just and instructive Satyr upon mankind in general" (*A Plot and No Plot*, I, 1). Cf. the prologue to *Every Man in His Humour*.

⁴ The function of Belvil and Baldernoe is similar to that of the younger Knowell and Brainworm in *Every Man in His Humour*, or Clerimont and Dauphine Eugenie in *The Silent Woman*.

⁵ The various disguises of Baldernoe recall those of Brainworm, Bull Sr, the "heavy father," is in the tradition of the elder Knowell (*Every Man in His Humour*); Bull Jr, the "would-be," resembles Fungoso (*Every Man out of His Humour*); and Macfleer, the braggart soldier, suggests Bobadill (*Every Man in His Humour*).

Jonsonian comedy of humours the love affair of Belvil and Sylvia is distinctly subordinated to the exposure of folly,⁶ and the action is a series of tricks by which Belvil and Baldeinoe gull the two Bulls, father and son. Finally, as Bull Sr himself points out, his situation is similar to that of Bartholomew Cokes, in Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair*,⁷ his predicament also has a parallel in that of Morose, in *The Silent Woman*.⁸

Dennis' second comedy, *The Comical Gallant, or The Amours of Sir John Falstaff* (1702), is an adaptation of Shakespeare's *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, a play which, as scholars have previously noted, bears some resemblance to the Jonsonian comedy of humours. But Dennis makes his alteration still more Jonsonian. In explaining his supposed improvements,⁹ he points to his purpose of reform through exposing the follies of mankind, defines "humour" in a manner not inconsistent with that of Jonson, and tries to justify his subordination of the love element by saying that "Shakespeare had little Love in the very best of his Plays, and Jonson less in his, and yet this last was one of the best Comick poets that ever was in the world."¹⁰ He omits certain scenes which he believes superfluous, notably those dealing with the quarrel of Shallow and Falstaff, and he further unifies the plot by making "everything instrumental to Fenton's marriage."¹¹ He makes Fenton the chief intriguer who controls the actions of a group of gulls.¹² Finally,

⁶ Jonson's attention to the exposure of folly rather than to the love element has often been mentioned, see, for example, A. H. Thorndike, *English Comedy* (New York, 1929), pp. 589-90.

⁷ "Bull Sr I have been used like a Bartholomew Cokes" (*A Plot and No Plot*, v, 1).

⁸ Both Bull Sr and Morose have been gulled by fake marriages, both appeal for aid to the very persons responsible for their troubles, both receive aid after paying the price, and the remedy in both cases is the same—the revelation that there has been no marriage.

⁹ See Frederick Kilbourne, *Alterations and Adaptations of Shakespeare* (Boston, 1906), p. 45, and Hazelton Spencer, *Shakespeare Improved* (Cambridge, 1927), p. 349, for evidence that Dennis did *not* improve the work of Shakespeare.

¹⁰ Hooker, *op cit*, I, 284-5.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, I, 280.

¹² In Dennis' adaptation it is Fenton who persuades Falstaff that Mrs Ford and Mrs Page are in love with him, who bribes Nym and Pistol to betray Falstaff, who induces the Host of the Garter to bring about the quarrel of Dr. Caius and Sir Hugh, and who arranges for the meeting at

he points out that he has made certain changes in order to emphasize the humours of Falstaff and of Ford, the jealous husband¹³

Dennis' third and last comedy, *Gibraltar, or The Spanish Adventure* (1705), is a play of the Spanish intrigue type and shows little resemblance to Jonson's comedy. However, it is significant that in the prologue the author continues to praise Jonson and that in his portrayal of Don Diego he emphasizes gulling in the Jonsonian manner¹⁴

It is evident, then, that Dennis approved of Jonson's theories and that in two of his three comedies the Jonsonian tradition survived. As an isolated example, Dennis' acceptance of Jonson's principles would mean little; but the addition of his name to the already established list of dramatists who continued the tradition may shed further light upon Jonson's connection with Restoration comedy.

C. B. GRAHAM

Wright Junior College, Chicago

ROCHESTER'S "BUFFOON CONCEIT"

In his *Rochesteriana* (1926), Johannes Prinz printed as an "extempore," under the title of "Spoken to a Post-boy, 1674," an old manuscript entry in his own copy of *The Poetical Works of the Earls of Rochester, etc.*, 1739. It consists of six lines in which the peer asks the post-boy "the readiest way to Hell."

The complete poem of fourteen lines appears in a manuscript volume entitled "A Choyce Collection of Songs, etc.," recently acquired by the Ohio State University Library.¹ The title of this poem (which may quite possibly have been the original of Prinz' version) is "Earle of Rochester's Conference with a Post Boy, 1674." The first six lines differ only slightly from Prinz' version. The entire poem follows:

Herne's Oak As an intriguier, therefore, he is far more important than in Shakespeare's play.

¹³ "I have added to some of the parts in order to heighten the characters and make them show the better." (Hooker, *op. cit.*, I, 280)

¹⁴ *Gibraltar*, IV, 1

¹ A folio volume of 325 pages, in two late seventeenth-century hands. Many of the poems have appeared in print, notably in various editions of *Poems on State-Affairs*. Most of them are dated, but rather inaccurately.

Son of a Whore G—d damn thee, cans't thou Tell
 A Peerless Peer the readiest Way to Hell?
 I've Outswill'd Bacchus, sworn of my own Make
 Oaths, Frighted Furies, & made Pluto quake
 Sw—d Whores more ways than ever Sodoms Walls
 Knew, or the Colledge of the Cardinals
 Witness Heroic Scars and wounds. Ne're go'
 Sear Cloths and Ulcers from the Top to th' Toe
 Frighted at my own Mischeifs I am fled,
 And basely left my Life's Defendor Dead
 But hang't, why do I mencon these poor Things?
 I have blasphem'd G—d, and libell'd Kings,
 The readiest Way to Hell, Boy, Quick, (Boy) Ne're stir
 The readiest way, my Lord's by Rochester.

Although it seems incredible that a poet could write so viciously of himself, I am persuaded that Rochester did so write. The poem is clearly his style of rough, vigorous verse, and his sense of irony was perfectly capable of such an attitude. Moreover, if we may disregard the assigned date, 1674, the line "And basely left my Life's Defendor Dead," is highly significant. This is certainly a reference to the affair at Epsom, in June, 1676, when Rochester acted the coward's part in a riot, and his "Life's Defendor," Captain Downes, was killed.² Of this affair, Rochester's enemy Sir Carr Scroope made much capital in a libel called "In Defense of Satire."³ Particularly he wrote of Rochester as one who

To fatal mid-night quarrels can betray
 His brave companion, and then run away,
 Leaving him to be murder'd in the street,
 Then put it off with some buffoon conceit

Ebsworth suggested that the "buffoon conceit" was Rochester's line "for all men would be cowards if they durst," from the "Satyr against Mankind."⁴ That line, however, is hardly a "buffoon conceit" within the Restoration meaning of the phrase. It is quite possible that Sir Carr was thinking of "The Earle of Rochester's Conference with a Post Boy."

J. HAROLD WILSON

The Ohio State University

² Cf. *Hatton Correspondence*, pp 133-134

³ *Miscellaneous Works of . . . Buckingham*, 1704

⁴ *Roxburghe Ballads*, iv, 570

THE CHARACTER IN THE ELIA ESSAYS

Character delineation forms the backbone of the Elia Essays. Of the forty-four non-critical essays in the *Essays of Elia* and *Last Essays of Elia*, thirty-six depend largely or altogether upon character sketching for their content and interest. Of the eight essays in which no character writing occurs, two are not essays, properly speaking, but extracts from letters ("Distant Correspondents" and "The Tombs in the Abbey"), one is occasional ("Rejoicing Upon The New Year's Coming of Age"), one is una fantasia, a report of a dream ("The Child Angel"), one contains anecdotes, rather than character sketches (On Books and Reading), and one is a description of newspapers to which Lamb had contributed ("Newspapers Thirty-five Years Ago"). Of the thirty-six which contain character writing, eight are devoted entirely to that form.¹ The remaining twenty-eight would be meatless without the portraits contained in them, though in one or two of the essays character drawing is introduced not formally or for itself or with any degree of continuity, but, as in "Grace Before Meat," the bits of portraits are a sort of grace or relish.

Lamb's penchant for character drawing can be ascribed to several reasons. First, his humanism, his delight in "odd fishes," "heads with some diverting twist in them"; second, his affectionate nature to which old friends and relatives were treasures to be lovingly preserved in his essays, and, third, his liking for the seventeenth century prose writers, whose books of characters may have caused him to attempt similar type characters. "The Convalescent" is an example, and "Imperfect Sympathies" contains excellent type characters of Scotchmen, Jews, Negroes, and Quakers. As a rule, however, Lamb is not content with the type alone. Sometimes, for instance, he uses it only as an introduction, as in "Poor Relations" which begins with a type character of a poor relation in the manner of Overbury and is followed by two individualized characters, one, Favel, for the tragic side of poor

¹ "Mrs. Battle's Opinions Upon Whist," "My Relations," "Old Benchers of the Inner Temple," "To the Shade of Ellitson and Ellitsoniana," "The Convalescent," "Captain Jackson," "The Superannuated Man," and Preface to the *Last Essays of Elia*.

relationship, the other to illustrate the comic possibilities.² It is not only Lamb's ability to limn the personality, the thing which marks, more than anything else, one individual from another, but his liking for self-portraiture which distinguishes his character drawing from that of the seventeenth century type writers. In this tendency Lamb is of his own time, though he is unlike his contemporaries in that he is rarely "confessional" and almost always humorous. But, no matter of what kind, it is Lamb's habit to illustrate with, when he does not devote his whole attention to, characters. He is uncomfortable and dissatisfied without the richness, piquancy, and variety of human temperament, mind, and manners. It is characteristic of him that his description of the old Margate Hoy is not of a boat, but of the people sailing in it, that his essay on the South Sea House has almost nothing to do with the House and everything with the men who worked there. "New Year's Eve" turns into an admirably humorous self-portrait. "Valentine's Day" offers an opportunity to illustrate a friend's character (Edward Burney), and Lamb is quite frank about it. "I only give this as a specimen of E. B. and his modest way of doing a concealed kindness." In "Mackery End" he cannot resist giving a full portrait of his sister. "Modern Gallantry" serves as an excuse for devoting half the essay to Joseph Paice, "the only pattern of consistent gallantry I have met with." When less than half of his composition upon chimney sweepers is past, Lamb leaves their praise for that of his friend Jem White, who occupies his pen for the remainder. He renders praise to Ellitson's Shade in a sort of character fantasy which is only an introductory fanfare, for he cannot rest there but must give "Ellitsoniana" in an anecdotal form that illustrates the actor's character to perfection.

Sometimes, in his eagerness, Lamb drags in characters by the ears to the detriment of structure in his essays and in a fashion almost absurd were it not for his enthusiasm. In "My First Play" he splits his essay with a character of his godfather Field, "the most gentlemanly of oilmen," and the essay is far gone before he reluctantly brings himself back to the proposed subject. In "Amicus Redivivus" he recounts an accident through which George Dyer comes near drowning, but leaves his dear friend suspended between life and death to give a character sketch of the

² See also "The Two Races of Men."

doctor who has been called in to revive him. Only when Lamb has exploited his latest find to his satisfaction do we learn the fate of the unfortunate Dyer. In "The Wedding" the important function involving a friend's daughter is held up to make a lengthy analysis of a type character of fond parents, male and female, as regards the marrying of a daughter.

In his best essays the characters are easily and naturally introduced, usually as an illustration of an idea. Ralph Bigod is employed in this way to illustrate the "greater race." In "Dream Children" the tone of affectionate and melancholy retrospect makes the introduction of the characters of grandmother Field and of his brother John in tune with the tender pathos of the whole. "Old China" while, on the surface, it is a bagatelle upon tea cups, gives a charming insight into the character of Bridget without which the essay would be commonplace. In any case, whether aesthetically satisfying or not, the backbone of the Elia Essays is character drawing.³

VARLEY LANG

The Johns Hopkins University

COLERIDGE'S MOUNT ABORA

Light may be thrown on Coleridge's Mount Abora by an entry in the first volume of the Reverend Clement Cruttwell's *New Universal Gazetteer, or, Geographical Dictionary* (3 vols., London, 1798) "Abur, a mountain of Arabia, in the country of Yemen 4 German miles WSW. Kataba." Cruttwell's residence at Bath suggests relationship with the Bath printer, R. Cruttwell, who printed Bowles' *Sonnets* as well as Southey's and Lovell's *Poems*.

HENRY PETTIT

The University of Colorado

³ I have not included "Popular Fallacies" in this article, but even here, where the nature of the subject and shortness of each section might preclude it, character drawing occurs. Another essay, "The Confessions of a Drunkard" is unique. It is a mock sermon in the form of a character sketch in the first person.

BORROWINGS FROM ANATOLE FRANCE BY
WILLA CATHER AND ROBERT NATHAN

In *Anatole France, 1844-1896* Professor E. P. Dargan states that Mme France possessed a dressmaker's model which exasperated her husband and which he finally tore to pieces¹. We may therefore assume that the dressmaker's model which was kept in the study of M. Bergeret, the hero of France's novel, *le Mannequin d'osier*, is autobiographical. The Bergeret model is interesting for another reason also. It has been adapted by two contemporary American novelists, who are indebted to Anatole France for the idea of placing it in the study of a scholar.

Miss Willa Cather, in *The Professor's House*, introduces two dressmaker's models. They stand in an attic room where the hero, Professor St. Peter, composes his books and articles in the field of European history. The author acknowledges her indebtedness to Anatole France by making St. Peter say, with respect to the models: "If they were good enough for Monsieur Bergeret, they are certainly good enough for me."²

Mr. Robert Nathan's novel *Winter in April* concerns a cynical but kindly old scholar, his adored granddaughter, his capable sister, his young disciple, his extraordinary maid, and a dressmaker's model. Here, except for the absence of a wife and the substitution of a granddaughter for a daughter, we have the leading characters from *le Mannequin d'osier*. Ellen, the granddaughter, sells her party gown for a charitable purpose. Henry Pennifer, her grandfather, discovers the gown on a dress-model in the window of a fashionable shop. Stealing the model as well as the gown, he takes it back to his study, where "at this moment she stands . . . beside my desk, giving a strange appearance to the familiar room."³

ELIOT G. FAY

The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.

¹ E. P. Dargan, *Anatole France, 1844-1896* (New York, 1937), 381, 2.

² Willa Cather, *The Professor's House* (New York, 1925), 19.

³ Robert Nathan, *Winter in April* (New York, 1937), 220, 21.

REVIEWS

De Quincey: A Portrait. By JOHN CALVIN METCALF. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1940. Pp. x + 210. \$2.00.

The Age of Tennyson. By G. M. YOUNG. Warton Lecture on English Poetry, British Academy, 1939. From the Proceedings of the British Academy, vol. xxv. London. Humphrey Milford, 1939. Pp. 20. \$0.60.

On the Diction of Tennyson, Browning and Arnold. By BERNARD GROOM. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939. Pp. 56. \$1.25. S. P. E., Tract No. lxx.

Arnold: Poetry and Prose, with William Watson's Poem and Essays by Lionel Johnson and H. W. Garrod. With an introduction and notes by E. K. CHAMBERS. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939. Pp. xxxvi + 187. \$1.25.

Metcalf's *De Quincey* is a charmingly written, beautifully printed book, offering, as the Author says in his Foreword, "no contribution to knowledge", merely a portrait. And the portrait is brilliantly drawn. The volume is the most vivid study of De Quincey yet to appear; but to those who have long awaited it, it brings some, perhaps unjustifiable, disappointments.

We could hardly have expected many new facts. Few can be expected after the volume of Mr. Sackville-West, the Hogg Letters edited by Professor Bonner, the articles by Professor Forward, and my edition of the *Diary of 1803* and my *Life*. Even the unpublished correspondence with Tait which has recently and unexpectedly turned up would seem to add little significant information, although I have not seen it. But we had hoped that Dr. Metcalf might have brought us new interpretations, perhaps a psychological analysis based on modern techniques; or a study of De Quincey's contributions to philosophy, economics and politics. As a matter of fact he does not relate De Quincey to the thought of his time in any way. If it is unkind to express disappointment when Dr. Metcalf wished to do something quite different, it will be worth while to point out that there are De Quinceyan problems still awaiting scholars.

But there are legitimate complaints against the volume in hand. First, there are careless statements which continue errors of older biographies which recent studies have corrected. I offer a few

typical examples: on page 18, it was not *Lord* Carbery who encouraged riding lessons at Laxton, but *Lady* Carbery (see my *Life*, p. 55). Nor did De Quincey's visit to Ireland last "far into the autumn" (page 16), for he left Westport on his way to England on 8 September (*Life*, p. 50). On page 50, De Quincey is said to have been "keeping terms" at the Middle Temple "before quitting Oxford or immediately afterwards." But the only record at the Middle Temple is that he was entered on 12 June, 1812 (*Life*, p. 199). And on page 190, "Mrs. MacBold" appears as one of the demon landladies, although so far as I know, she is the creation of Emerson's poor memory or of the entertaining gossip of Dr. Brown and Mrs. Crowe (*Life*, p. 452 n). And on page 81, De Quincey was not introduced to Taylor and Hessey by Lamb, but by Talfourd, as De Quincey himself tells us (Masson, *De Quincey's Works*, III, 271), and we have other confirmatory evidence of this. Dr. Metcalf tells us in the Foreword that his book "was completed before the appearance of several recent books on De Quincey's life and work." One could wish that he had revised it in the light of their findings.

Second, in the later years when the evidence of De Quincey's reminiscences gives way to the harsh evidence of letter, court records and memoirs, Dr. Metcalf tends to overlook some of the darker implications. There is the distressing attitude towards Wilson which comes out most clearly in the conversations in London in 1821 recorded by Woodhouse. There is the hardness, almost persecution complex, in relation to De Quincey's creditors, especially in the case of some of his landlords and landladies who tend in his imagination to become "devils," when they were merely trying to earn a precarious living by renting rooms. There is the disquieting guile which he showed in regard to the mortgage on The Nab and to the borrowings on his future prospects of a legacy from his mother. One could name other attitudes which distress the lover of De Quincey, which I claim to be. But of these shadows Dr. Metcalf seems to be mostly unaware so that the portrait he presents lacks, to my mind, complete truth.

As a result of the limited aim of the book, Dr. Metcalf offers us little searching criticism of the essays, although I commend warmly the chapter in which he gives an interesting and careful appraisal of the papers upon Coleridge, Wordsworth, etc. which gave so much offense at the time of their appearance. He points out that De Quincey's interest was in what we call "journalism" and that he offered real portraits far in advance of his time—if one overlooks Carlyle's description of Coleridge in his *Life of Sterling*!

In spite of its shortcomings, the book has more than enough virtues to make it a delightful introduction to the Opium Eater and one certain to tempt the reader to try De Quincey's writings for himself.

When G. M. Young speaks upon the Victorian Era, as in *The*

Portrait of an Age and here, less learned and imaginative scholars must listen. Relations, implications and patterns take on new clarity. In this brilliant lecture, not without some of the overtones of James Joyce's priceless pun, "Alfred Lawn-Tennyson" is examined as offering his time what it demanded so that he deservedly became *The Poet* of the Nineteen Hundreds, not only speaking the language of England but of the whole western world in that age which in certain aspects is so terribly remote from ours. His was the perfect adjustment of a man of letters to "the climate of opinion." His descriptive power met the needs of contemporary senses refined by the Romantic poets, met the interest in Natural History, the love of landscape stimulated by travel and drawing until "devotion to nature became a nervous craving." His description was devoured by a public becoming "in spirit suburban . . . instinctively fighting for breath." And furthermore he offered such accuracy as to satisfy the men of science themselves and tended "to constrict for a time our range of poetry." He gave a moral age gnomic, hortatory, public utterance, and decorous eroticism, characterised by the American school-boy (quoted by Mr. Young) "There is some pretty hot necking in Lord Tennyson, only they never quite make it." He appealed to respectability, involved in Victorian society with the idea of bettering oneself and one's family, in line with the whole range of progress and evolution; a society so devoid of the comic spirit as to be eager for vapidty and the "embarrassingly silly." And he offered a consoling religious faith emphatically called for, namely that in an evanescent world man is not an incident but a consummation.

The freshness of the lecture is in its approach to Tennyson from the standpoint of his public and in its richness of generalisation and memorable phrasing.

Mr. Groom gives us a first-rate verbal study concerned with the word habits of a great triumvirate and evolving fresh critical observations. Each poet is separately studied and the unity is secured by contrast. The author has a keen mind, aware that words and style are "unconsciously autobiographical." While he does not elaborate upon the autobiographical implications, his comments point the way to elaboration. Every student of the poets will find happy confirmation of biographical characteristics in such phrases as the following: Tennyson's "general attitude is not that of a man speaking to men, nor is he on quite easy terms with contemporary life" (page 98); Browning's "inner life was so robust that he delighted to rub shoulders with the outer world . . . his work reflects many aspects of the language of his time; it is a magazine of colloquial phrases" (page 118); and Arnold "seems to be putting a strain upon his invention, for felicitous expressions in one piece are sometimes almost exactly repeated in another" (page 144).

More specifically, Mr. Groom contrasts Tennyson's conscious use

of "poetic" word and phrase for aesthetic effect with Browning's use of them "as makeshifts" and Arnold's deliberate avoidance of the entangling romantic tradition, Tennyson's avoidance of colloquial language with Browning's excessive use of it in giving his monologuists "absolute freedom" of expression. Tennyson is word-minded, stippling his verse, Browning is a word collector, "centrifugal" in diction, and Arnold, except within the narrow range of his best inspiration, is concerned not with words—often unfortunate—but with the whole.

Most of the study scrutinizes words themselves—neologisms, compounds, archaisms, "poetic" words, etc and what the poets do with them. It is not statistical, but richly representative and accompanied by careful footnotes. The brochure is difficult to summarize, for it is full of meat. It is important for any student of the Victorian period and unexpectedly rewarding.

The Arnold volume is put out under the protection of distinguished names, yet the whole is "somewhat lazily handled." Even the introduction is merely an adaptation of E. K. Chambers's Warton lecture, and his notes, while careful, are of the most meager sort. The poems are, of course, selected and the prose is not only selected but cut up into snippets. The essays of Johnson, Garrod and Chambers are fine pieces of critical writing, sensitive and agreeable. But there is little indication that Arnold is *of* his time and says anything *to* his time. If Arnold knew, as Garrod says, "very little about the history of literature and he liked to think (what may be true) that great poetry drops from the skies," certainly the present editor acts as if he thought so too. The book belongs to an outmoded method of teaching literature and would seem to be a rather futile contribution to the modern classroom.

HORACE A. EATON

Syracuse University

The Road to Tryermaine, A Study of the History, Background, and Purposes of Coleridge's "Christabel" By ARTHUR H. NETHERCOT. The University of Chicago Press, 1939. Pp. ix + 230. \$3.00.

As the title of Professor Nethercot's book indicates, we are offered here a companion volume to Professor J. L. Lowes' *Road to Xanadu*, which was welcomed some years ago as a masterpiece of creative criticism. Professor Nethercot has followed the method of his great predecessor, but very wisely has refrained from giving as a subtitle to his work, "A Study in the Ways of the Imagination." Because whereas in *The Road to Xanadu* one seemed to be brought into a closer intimacy with the workings of Coleridge's mind than criticism had ever achieved before with almost any author,

The Road to Tryermaine does not strike one as containing more exciting revelations than can be gathered in any diligent and—as the French would say—*fouillé* study of sources. Professor Lowes' method is there, but his marvelous power of illuminating association, his insight into the operations of the "hooked atoms" of memory are absent, and perhaps all is said when we say that Professor Lowes' own imagination is that of an artist, and Professor Nethercot's mind is that of the industrious scholar. We would have refrained from this invidious comparison, if the title itself of the book had not challenged it, and if Professor Nethercot himself had not claimed to have unveiled that very mystery which would have been only skirted by Professor Lowes.

But first of all, does *Christabel*, or what is left of *Christabel*, deserve to be called "the most fascinating and enigmatic of literary conundrums"? We may doubt it when we read (p. 139), "Just what principles Coleridge intended to embody in Geraldine will probably never be known with absolute dogmatism. Apparently he was none too clear on the subject himself, or he would not have undergone the abortive agonies that he did to finish his story satisfactorily." A riddle can be solved the elements of which are hidden away, but exist somewhere, but how would it be possible to find out the original ingredients of what was never a complete design, but an inchoate and imperfect sketch, about which the author was none too clear himself? Professor Nethercot is well aware of this difficulty, since he compares his reconstruction to "an *ex pede Herculeum* affair—or the sketching of a unicorn from a shaid of hoof, a shoulder blade, and a piece of corkscrewed horn," and who can say what Hercules and the unicorn really looked like, since they never existed? The very moment one is convinced that Coleridge himself was none too clear on the subject of his poem, a great part of its fascination vanishes, because our curiosity is doomed to find nothing to feed on.

So Professor Nethercot could never satisfy us with real food, but just with a full course of plausible surrogates whose effect on our system is certainly filling, even if not absolutely stimulating. I do not mean to imply that his research into the nature of vampires, lamias, etc. is off the point, he no doubt succeeds in classifying Geraldine as a member of that terrifying class of monsters, in fact as the first vampire which was ever introduced into English literature, and he rightly wonders how a critic of genius like Professor Lowes or a dabbler in the occult like Mr. Montague Summers could miss that discovery. But then, what of it? What is Geraldine actually doing to *Christabel*? We are seized with unspeakable horror while reading Henry James' *The Turn of the Screw*, although its mystery is never fully revealed, or rather, is revealed only to our subconscious, but do we experience a similar thrill in reading *Christabel*? Or rather do we see our dream tail-

ing off like Charles Lamb's marine vision in "Witches and other Night-fears"?

I think there is a moment in which Professor Nethercot's reconstruction is on the point of becoming really exciting, when he writes (p 69):

Yet not only is Geraldine a woman, with vampire characteristics, in the second canto Christabel also shows unmistakable signs of turning into the same sort of creature. In her manner, in her appearance, in the sounds she utters, she imitates all that is most sinister in her previous night's bed-fellow. Whatever Geraldine may be, Christabel is clearly being transformed into a similar being—likewise through no fault or willingness of her own. Those who have been infected with a vampire become vampires themselves.

And when he completes this interpretation on p. 128 with these words

What is more likely, then, than that Coleridge, in deciding to brand Geraldine with some mark symbolical of her sin, should have delineated it in terms of serpentry, and especially, perhaps, in terms of a snake preparing for rejuvenation and ready to shed its old skin for a new one?

After all this, we would have expected a conclusion not unlike that of Poe's "Ligeia," the more so, that Poe, in making the victim Rowena Lady of *Tremaine*, seems to have had at the back of his mind Coleridge's *Trygermaine*, or, shall we say, such an interpretation of *Christabel* as is sketched in the passages just referred to. Could Geraldine, woman and sinner, free herself of her mark of shame on condition that she should transfer it to such a pure creature as Christabel? Is it a case akin to that of Melmoth the Wanderer?

Such a possibility seems to be ruled out by Professor Nethercot in the course of his book; he questions the diabolical nature of Geraldine, sees in her "an unwilling and contrite instrument of destiny," and concludes with finding Derwent Coleridge's interpretation "substantially justified." According to this interpretation, "the sufferings of Christabel were to have been represented as vicarious, endured for her 'lover far away', and Geraldine, no witch or goblin, or malignant being of any kind, but a spirit, executing her appointed task with the best good will." Only thus Professor Nethercot finds a link with Coleridge's alleged inspiration from Crashaw's "Hymn to the Name and Honor of the Admirable Sainte Teresa." Christabel, like Christ whose name is contained in hers, and like the Spanish Saint, would suffer a "vicarious" martyrdom, atone for the sins of other people. Is then Geraldine playing the part of the wounding Seraphim in St. Teresa's famous vision?

I think that there is much to be said against this whitewashing of Geraldine into, almost, a "fair sister of the Seraphim." There is a clue which Professor Nethercot has not taken up; it lies in an

apparently harmless descriptive line of the poem, l 34 of the First Part:

And naught was green upon the oak
But moss and rarest mistletoe

It might at first seem of little moment that Coleridge should have been recollecting here a line from *Titus Andronicus*, II, III, 95

The trees, though summer, yet forlorn and lean,
O'ercome with moss and baleful mistletoe

But if one glances at the context from which these lines are taken, one is suddenly aware that the sinister wood described by Tamora, and her own feigned story of violence, are paralleled in the setting of the opening portion of *Christabel* and in Geraldine's story of how she suffered violence at the hands of five warriors. Tamora says that her persecutors threatened to bind her "unto the body of a dismal yew," so that she should die or fall mad at the fearful cries of fiends and hissing snakes which would congregate at the spot "at dead time of the night." Geraldine says that her abductors tied her on a palfrey and then placed her underneath the oak where Christabel finds her. Tamora is a diabolical liar, if Coleridge thought of her while writing his lines about Geraldine's plight, is it not obvious to conclude that he conceived Geraldine as a wicked hypocrite like Tamora, enlisting assistance under false pretences? Would "an unwilling and contrite instrument of destiny" bear comparison with such a monster as Tamora? Surely "the maid devoid of guile and sin" who

. passively did imitate
That look of dull and treacherous hate

was the victim of an *envoûtement* designed to no such Christian purpose as a vicarious atonement of sin!

Professor Nethercot's contribution extends beyond the chief point in the poem, the meaning of Geraldine, he has been able to trace the names and local habitations in the poem, and makes good fun of Donald R. Tuttle's pretended discovery of sources. One wonders whether sometimes his own subtlety has not been led astray, as for instance when he traces an elaborate origin (p. 156 ff.) for "the lamp with twofold silver chain . . . fastened to an angel's feet," a common enough article in Catholic churches all over the continent of Europe; or when he associates "Peak and pine!" with the penances in Dante's *Purgatory*. The operations of the "hooked atoms" of memory are not laid bare in these last cases as in Professor Lowes' work; there is no cogency of demonstration.

MARIO PRAZ

Università di Roma

Shakespeare in Germany 1740-1815 Edited by R. PASCAL.
Cambridge, Eng. The University Press, 1937. Pp. x + 199.
\$2.50.

Shakespeares Macbeth als Drama des Barock. By MAX DEUTSCHBEIN. Leipzig. Quelle & Meyer, n. d. Pp. iv + 130. RM 6 (paper) or RM 7 (cloth)

Die dramatische Technik Thomas Kyds. By PETER WILHELM BIESTERFELDT. Halle/Saale: Max Niemeyer, 1936. Pp. 111 + 115. RM 12.

Kirchengeschichte und Rechtsgeschichte in England (von der Reformation bis zum fruhen 18 Jahrhundert). HEINRICH ARNEKE. Halle/Saale. Max Niemeyer, 1937. Pp. vi + 355. RM 13.50

The main purpose of Pascal's *Shakespeare in Germany 1740-1815* is to make readily accessible to students the more important Shakespearean criticism which appeared in Germany before 1827, but the book will be very useful also to scholars. Hitherto one has had to search for the material in scattered places, and some of the works have been rather hard to obtain outside Germany. Within the available space, the editor has made a judicious selection, in fact, it is really amazing how much significant material has been assembled into the one volume. The "Introduction" is a thirty-six-page running account of Shakespearean criticism in Germany during the period covered, most of the quotations being translated into English for the benefit of persons whose command of German is not adequate for reading the passages in the original, stressing "that the attitude to Shakespeare in this period is not merely a matter of aesthetic appreciation, but is, even more, a part of a changing moral and social outlook," the editor suggests "connections between the aesthetic, moral and social principles raised by the writings on Shakespeare" (p. ix). The book includes twenty-three pages of fragmentary German translations of Shakespeare (by Mendelssohn, Lessing, and others) and extracts from complete translations (by Borck and others). A nine-page "Chronological Table" in three parallel columns is valuable for giving a bird's-eye view of (1) "Criticism, Biography, etc.," (2) "Translations, Adaptations, Synopses," and (3) "Productions" in Germany from 1682 to 1836. (Incidentally, Mylius' translation [dated 1749—issued in the spring of 1750] of Voltaire's *Lettres sur les Anglais* is misdated as 1753.)

Deutschbein, in *Shakespeares Macbeth als Drama der Barock*, classifies *Julius Caesar*, *Troilus and Cressida*, and *Hamlet* as "Renaissance" dramas, and *Othello*, *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, and

Antony and Cleopatra as "Baroque" tragedies. He states the fundamental difference between the two groups as follows:

Der charakteristische Unterschied zwischen den Renaissance- und Barockdramen liegt nun darin, dass der harmonische Kosmos vollständig gebrochen erscheint und einer dualistischen, antithetischen Auffassung der Welt weicht. Der Mensch ist nicht mehr der Mittelpunkt eines geordneten Seins, sondern er ist in seiner Existenz unmittelbar bedroht, denn die entscheidenden, Existenz schaffenden Kräfte sind nicht mehr menschlicher Art, sondern sie sind jenseits aller menschlichen Natur, in einer metaphysischen, über die Natur hinausgehenden Existenzform vorhanden (p. 9).

There is a struggle between "Damonie" and "Logos" (Chap. 4), according to p. 91, the former seems to be destructive forces, and the latter constructive forces. The conception of "Damonie" is based upon Goethe's "Vielmehr ist das Damonische weder göttlicher noch menschlicher noch teuflischer Natur, sondern es ist eine Synthese von entgegengesetzten Qualitäten" (p. 20). In *Macbeth* the main scene of this conflict is in the soul of the title character (p. 47), who has a dual nature: (1) certain "demonische Anlagen" and (2) "ein starkes Bewusstsein von der Existenz der Wertwelt, die für ihn die Grundlage seiner sozialen Bindungen ist" (p. 49). Demoniac forces which influence Macbeth are the Weird Sisters and Lady Macbeth (p. 79). To increase the "Baroque" atmosphere, Shakespeare uses two innovations in the technique of characterization in *Macbeth* (to what extent these are employed in the other "Baroque" tragedies is not clearly stated). One is animal symbolism, for instance, Macbeth is associated with the wolf and the bear (p. 88), and Lady Macbeth with the snake (p. 92). The other innovation is a sort of magic picture ("magisches Merkbild"); for instance, something like a spell that prevents Lady Macbeth from killing Duncan comes upon her when she sees his resemblance to her father (p. 94). The use of foils—which are contrasting figures without significance of their own, such as the hired murderers in relationship to Macbeth—reaches its peak in *Macbeth* (Chap. 21). Deutschbein's book is stimulating, and many parts are fascinating to read. In the judgment of the reviewer, however, some of the conclusions are not justified, such as the contention that "equivocation" is the main problem in *Macbeth* (Chap. 3) rather than that the references to equivocation in the Porter's speeches (II, III) probably are merely incidental satire on the Jesuits; moreover, the main thesis and some of the subordinate conclusions depend so much upon comparisons among the seven dramas classed by the author as "Renaissance" or "Baroque" that similar analyses of the other six plays would be desirable (and analyses of certain plays before 1599 by Shakespeare and others would also be helpful). Some of

the terminology seems unnecessarily complicated, some merely probable dates (those of *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, and *Antony and Cleopatra*) are assumed to be definite (p. 7), and, in discussions of innovations, a weakness in method is that in only one instance is there a differentiation between what Shakespeare found in the main source and what he added.

Biesterfeldt's *Die dramatische Technik Thomas Kyds*, in spite of its comprehensive title, treats only *The Spanish Tragedy*. The most significant parts of the volume are Chapter iv ("Die szenische Darstellung") and Chapter v ("Der dramatische Aufbau"), which contain interesting contributions. The former is an illuminating investigation of the staging of the play, discussing chiefly on what portion of the stage each scene was presented. Among the conclusions of Chapter v are the following: (1) that, in respect to the point of the story at which the play begins, *The Spanish Tragedy* is a compromise between the traditional English drama, which begins *ab ovo* (that is, would have opened with the great battle in which Don Andrea was killed), and the classical school, which concentrates upon the last phase (that is, would have started after the murder of Horatio), and (2) that Kyd's piece made an important advance toward Shakespeare's technique by being built up more systematically from scene to scene in regard to the total effect than was customary in English plays, of which the old *King Lear* is typical. The author agrees with those who believe that the present Act III was originally divided into two acts, but his new argument, based upon his structural analysis, is not very convincing (pp. 83-85). The first three chapters, which are really introductory, contain much unessential material; for instance, the plot synopsis of nearly four pages is superfluous, inasmuch as one must be familiar with the text itself to understand the discussion, and a person not acquainted with the tragedy would hardly be interested in such a specialized study. A seven-page bibliography suggests that the author made a thorough investigation of his problem.

The title of Arneke's *Kirchengeschichte und Rechtsgeschichte in England* is somewhat misleading. The work is not a history of events but consists chiefly of discussions of the significant writings (1) of outstanding British Protestant theologians (John Foxe, Matthew Parker, James Ussher, Thomas Fuller, Jeremy Collier, and Edward Stillingfleet) and (2) of prominent British writers on jurisprudence (Edward Coke, Roger Twysden, John Selden, and Matthew Hale) from about 1550 to about 1750. Within the scope attempted, the book is a well-planned and careful piece of work and should prove valuable to English literary historians and others desiring a survey of the two fields treated or a guide for intensive study of individual authors. Aids for the latter purpose are a thirty-one-page classified bibliography (with some bio-

graphical data) of significant writings published from 1538 to 1763 and a five-page list of pertinent modern works

PAUL P. KIES

State College of Washington

D. H. Lawrence and Susan His Cow By WILLIAM YORK TINDALL.
New York Columbia University Press, 1939. Pp. xvi +
231 \$2.75

Modern Poetry and the Tradition. By CLEANTH BROOKS. Chapel
Hill, North Carolina The University of North Carolina
Press, 1939. Pp. xiv + 253. \$3 00.

No two books could be more disparate within a field than these of Mr Tindall and Mr. Brooks. Mr Tindall so belabours the accident of what he dislikes that he comes to identify the whole substance of his material with it, his work is criticism, if at all, only by an act of violence. His book on D. H. Lawrence shows, from an alien point of view, the least sympathy for motive, the least charity for deed, and the most positive animus in construction outside the critical writings of H. L. Mencken and Irving Babbitt. Lacking the drive of Mencken and the conceptual vigour of Babbitt—lacking too any grace of the language—his book shows as at bottom frivolous. You cannot use it in the effort to understand Lawrence, but only as a substitute for that effort. Even its putative usefulness as a counter-irritant disappears when you resume Lawrence's text.

This judgment would not be worth making if it were not analogous to the judgment that must be made on almost everything that has been written about Lawrence—excepting notably what has been written by Gregory, Eliot, and Huxley, and it makes no difference in the judgment whether the effort was, as with Mr Tindall, to attack by substitution, to adopt for aggrandizement as with Mrs. Luhan, or, as with so many, just an effort to merge the critic's self in the quicksand aspect of Lawrence. The judgment is, that none of them deals much with the objective value of what Lawrence wrote—which may be what is commonly overlooked but which alone has any effect. What these books show is the enormous attractive force of Lawrence as a *possible* figure, a symbol, a myth, of the essential sickness of our time which is the sickness of the untenable position. Mr. Tindall is on the side of those who see the untenableness and nothing else, who see nothing of the strength of imagination and sensibility which brought Lawrence to occupy it, the great strength without which the great weakness would not have mattered, the strength, precisely, which brought Mr. Tindall as well as those who oppose him to make criticism of Lawrence.

Mr. Tindall's plan was so to explore the "wider significance" of Susan the cow as a means "to a better understanding of some of the problems of our literature, society, judgment, and taste." The tone—the prejudice of manner—with which he conducts his exploration prevents his success. Mr. Brooks, too, had a thesis, that there has been during the last generation "a critical revolution of the order of the Romantic Revolt", so that it becomes necessary once more, as with Wordsworth and Coleridge, to relate the contemporary with the traditional. Any account which ignored that relation, says Mr Brooks, would not "succeed in making us aware of the full significance of modern poetry—probably [would] not succeed in making modern poetry intelligible." It is the limitation of his essay that he relates modern poetry chiefly to the tradition as it stood in the first half of the seventeenth century, thus following the critical work of Eliot. Because the limitation is a matter of sympathy and training and not of prejudice and ignorance, its action is largely heuristic. It helps him discover facts and possibilities in modern poetry, enables him for the most part to maintain contact with it, and as constantly drives his reader into the poetry and not aside from it. The version of poetry his book makes is not complete, it is not the only version, but it is usable and helpful with regard to other versions—with regard to those inchoate, cumulative versions which we all of us actually employ as we read. His theory is, in effect, a means of organizing the values he feels, which, organized, encourage close and stimulating observation of facts about the verse he chooses to deal with. Only where the facts fail, does the thesis intrude which is the case with all theses in any field of thinking, and represents merely the radical weakness of the mind itself. No mind can work long, and some minds cannot work at all without the aid of a thesis, a set of principles, a revelation, as primary tool; and all minds suffer again and again from the tendency to overelaborate tools at the expense of the work to be done. The work is too difficult, suddenly at some point alien; the tools are our own and come by quick habit easy to use. Facility marks us; we make criticism for criticism's sake.

The point is that readers of good will can ignore all but the playing value of tools and terms and frames and scaffolds, and fasten on the discovered values, the job of work actually done by the critic who, first, has himself shown good will towards his material. He will so find his sensibility absorbed, where argument would merely have exhausted it. In Mr. Brooks' essays—for they are not single but deliberately loose about his thesis—it is the discoveries that count, equally for him and for us. The rehearsal of Eliot's *Waste Land*, even after eighteen years' familiarity with that poem, discovers the substance of it afresh; so does the comment on Yeats' two poems about Byzantium. Again, the essay on Frost, MacLeish, and Auden, for example, is full of discriminations which, whether made in poetry alone or elsewhere as well, seem especially

worth putting forward in these deprived days. "Irony which maintains an equilibrium between opposed attitudes, irony which acts as a stabilizing force, is hardly to be found in MacLeish's poetry at all. His best poetry is of a kind to which such irony is irrelevant. . . . MacLeish's sensibility is rich but lacks principles. His poetry does not have the intricacy of idea necessary to the poetry of a poet like Yeats. . . . If MacLeish represents the unprincipled sensibility, Auden represents, possibly, the sensibility fortified with principles, or perhaps, changing the viewpoint, the sensibility at the mercy of a set of principles." However that may be, and whether our time is deprived or merely interdicted, the point here wanted is plain; that by exploration of the actual operative sensibility of the writers in hand, Mr. Brooks does succeed, where Mr. Tindall fails, in promoting "a better understanding of some of the problems of our literature, society, judgment, and taste."

R. P. BLACKMUR

Princeton University

The Old Germanic Principles of Name-Giving. By HENRY B. WOOLF. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1939. Pp. xii + 299. \$4.

In *The Old Germanic Principles of Name-Giving*, Henry B. Woolf has made a significant contribution to the literature of onomatology. This work is designed to serve three purposes: it is "historical in that it is an attempt to describe with completeness and accuracy certain customs of the Germanic peoples of the early Middle Ages, it is literary in that it throws light on several passages in *Beowulf*; but it may best be described as philological" in the wider sense of the term.

In order to accomplish these ends, Dr. Woolf examines in turn the name-giving practices of the ruling houses in each of the Old English kingdoms, those of certain non-royal English families, those evident in Old English heroic poetry, and finally those of whatever other Germanic peoples he is able to secure material on, ranging from the Scandinavians in the North to the Langobards in the South and the Burgundians in the West. In each case the examination is followed by whatever conclusions may be drawn concerning the following points: the proportion of dithematic names as compared with monothematic, the extent and nature of alliteration, of theme variation whether initial or final, of repetition, the use of nicknames, and finally the influence of women on the naming practices of these peoples.

At the very outset of his study it was necessary for Dr. Woolf to establish genealogies for those families with which he is concerned.

In doing so, he chose to reexamine the available source material and to draw his own conclusions rather than to accept the genealogies already available in such works as Lappenberg and Earle. This fresh reconsideration alone would serve to make Dr. Woolf's study a highly important contribution, for Lappenberg's work is more than one hundred years old and even Earle's antedates the present century. Naturally Dr. Woolf has been able to take advantage of recent scholarship on moot points, and although his genealogies in the main do not differ radically from those of his predecessors, such conclusions as that of the identification of the Wessex kings *Cutha* and *Cuthwulf* as the same person are important for the present-day reader.

It is scarcely to the purpose here to present in review Dr. Woolf's findings in respect to each of the stylistic qualities with which the investigation is concerned, nor do his results lend themselves to easy briefing. Every reader will be grateful, however, for the concise summary, on page 93, of the practices of the various Old English royal families in respect to front- and end-variation and for the tabular presentations of name themes in each discussion of this matter. The discovery of the greater prevalence of monothematic names in the lower classes as late as the eleventh century is of especial interest, and the suggestion that there is here a survival of older custom is, I believe, perfectly sound.

The discussion of *Beowulf* in the light of the historical evidence about name-giving practices is provocative particularly for its repetition of the suggestion (made first by Malone and discussed elsewhere more extensively by Woolf) that *Beowulf* may have been a nickname, and that the Geatish hero was in reality the *Ælfhere* who is mentioned in line 2604 of the poem. Dr. Woolf also does the student of *Beowulf* a service by pointing out that the names of the Danes who appear in this poem are bound together by characteristics other than alliteration in *h*. In this connection it may be noted that the author follows Malone in his reconstruction of the name of Healfdene's daughter, and indeed the whole treatment of the *Beowulf* leans heavily upon Professor Malone's work.

For me the least satisfactory portion of Dr. Woolf's study was his attempt to determine the feminine influence in the giving of names. Although the problem must necessarily have loomed large in the author's examination of his materials, the results seem so inconclusive that they might well have been omitted from the completed work. Moreover, I am very dubious about the assumption which is stated as follows in connection with the naming practices of the Langobards: "In three cases the names of the children show maternal influence, the father apparently having had no say in the selection of his children's names." Must one conclude that a name theme drawn from the mother's family is necessarily chosen over and above the protests of the father? Is it not conceivable, particularly in a situation where the maternal family is of higher rank

than that of the father, that the father might not be proud and even eager to select a name theme from the mother's family?

I must confess also to some difficulty in following Dr. Woolf's graphic presentation of genealogical relationships. He was faced with the problem of fitting short bits of context in between many of his tables, so he chose to present these in single page widths instead of the double pages which are more frequently employed. In situations where large families are involved, this frequently necessitates a dropping of the descendants of one brother below those of another instead of the more desirable horizontal alignment, and some confusion is likely to result.

The real contribution that Dr. Woolf has made to the scholarship of this subject lies in the synthesis which his work presents. Many of the problems which he considers have been the subjects of special studies; some of them admirable but generally limited in scope. Merely to have made an examination of the names from the Old English heroic poetry alongside of an analysis of the name-giving practices of the Anglo-Saxons themselves would have constituted a step in advance of any study which has been made up to now, to present all this, however, in the light of an onomatological analysis of the other Germanic peoples, is to give a third dimension to what otherwise would have been a flat picture. Moreover, I wish to cite the concluding chapter in particular as an evidence of the wholly commendable objectivity and sanity with which the whole task has been carried out.

ALBERT H. MARCKWARDT

University of Michigan

A Milton Handbook. Third Edition By JAMES HOLLY HANFORD. New York: Crofts, 1939. Pp. xii + 439. \$2.10

Milton in Chancery. By J. MILTON FRENCH. New York. Modern Language Association, 1939. Pp. x + 428. \$3.00.

Milton's Literary Milieu. By GEORGE WESLEY WHITING. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1939. Pp. xiv + 401. \$3.50.

The third edition of Professor Hanford's *Milton Handbook* is seventy-three pages longer than its predecessor. The bibliography is strengthened by the addition of 109 titles (only twenty-seven of which could have been included before), but is marred by the unfortunate dropping of Gilbert's *Geographical Dictionary* and the edition of the familiar letters by the Tillyards. The most striking revisions and additions include a new appendix on "Milton and the Universities," a considerably augmented chapter on "Style

and Versification," an altered introduction to the prose, augmented notes on the composition and cosmology of *Paradise Lost*, and a concise summary of recent opinion and investigation. As a means of keeping perspective on Miltonic studies the *Handbook* is indispensable. Nearly 130 new footnotes and many revisions of opinion in the text give evidence of the critical speculations of the past decade.

The biographical materials discovered since Masson seemed to Hanford in his second edition "mere gleanings", now they are "considerable" Professor French's long and formidable *Milton in Chancery* is an excellent case in point. This careful, fully documented study of ten law suits involving the Miltons, father and son, offers no new answer to the perplexing questions in Milton biography; rather, it provides us with the kind of data which has tantalized, not satisfied, the biographers of Shakespeare. It is source material, and "confines itself to the presentation of the facts, from which the reader is free to draw his own conclusions." *Milton in Chancery* is, therefore, a volume to put on the shelf beside Hamilton's *Original Papers*, Hunter's *Sheaf of Gleanings*, Marsh's *Papers*, and similar contributions—some of which it supplements, some it supersedes. Its text consists of 146 pages; its notes and appendices, almost 250 pages. A full index promises to be especially useful.

One finishes this book (which, through no fault of the author, is not easy reading) with respect for French's thorough research, and with willing assent to the one inference which the writer permits himself "Milton was certainly not a star who dwelt apart from the workaday life of the world. . . . His character was built to no small degree on the years in Chancery." In his introduction French had anticipated this conclusion by declaring: "If any statement ever made about Milton was more untrue and misleading than Wordsworth's famous dictum, that Milton was 'like a star and dwelt apart,' it must be difficult to discover." But Wordsworth spoke of Milton's *soul*, not Milton, and the remainder of this famous (and misunderstood) sonnet sings the Milton that England then, and now, hath need of—for reasons which French rightly emphasizes.

Professor Whiting also seeks to show that Milton did not dwell apart, but in every other respect *Milton's Literary Milieu* is unlike French's book. It is composed of fourteen chapters and two appendices, each essentially independent, each dealing with the contemporary background of some Miltonic conceptions. The author ranges over a variety of subjects—the story of the Creation, the history of the world, Milton's use of maps, melancholy, pagan deities, Samson, the background of divers pamphlets—but hardly enough to achieve the professed aim: "to survey somewhat systematically and comprehensively the contemporary setting of Milton's work." Whiting desires "to show that a number of Milton's

ideas, by some scholars attributed to specific sources, were shared by his contemporaries," and it is a pity that he does not believe enough in his own laudable thesis. When he insists, as he does far too often, that we substitute his new sources for those just discredited, his own good logic backfires. The book must be read but read with unusual caution, for the author omits much, too often overlooks the work of other scholars, trips on his own logic, and invalidates even his most useful conclusions by widespread inaccuracy (in at least one set of parallel passages adding a word to Milton's text and then remarking "the similarity of phrasing," p. 289, line 6)

These generalizations may be illustrated from the chapter on *Eikonoklastes*. Whiting profitably demonstrates that most of the parallels cited by Lowenhaupt from *Eikon Alethine* "have little weight when one examines the language of other books and documents," but concludes that these *other* books "seem to be Milton's real sources" and lists thirty-seven parallels of his own. May's *History of Parliament* particularly shows "Milton's heavy indebtedness." Must we assume, however, that Milton turned to May for information when he probably had access to the great collection of tracts being made by his friend Thomason (who, it is to be remembered, published May's *History*)? Surely Milton could have found his data in the same ready "sources" used by May. Milton, moreover, was sufficiently aware of current events not to need "sources" for many of the statements which Whiting cites. For example, in parallel 17 Milton says, "such word was sent us," and May says, "it was usually talked among the people of that time"—and Whiting omits both these statements from his quotations. More serious is the author's failure to realize that Milton's passages in italics are quoted. In number 37 Milton carefully quotes three words from *The Kings Cabinet*, and we are supposed to note "verbal parallelism." There are three other instances of such misinterpretation of Milton's intent (nos. 1, 13, 36), and three instances in which Whiting fails to reproduce the italics of the original (nos. 10, 13, 24)

WILLIAM R PARKER

The Ohio State University

Perilous Balance The Tragic Genius of Swift, Johnson, and Sterne.

By W. B. C. WATKINS. Princeton. Princeton University Press, 1939. Pp. x + 172. \$2.00.

"All three waged a lifelong battle against disease, melancholia, tragedy. Swift, at one extreme, surrendered to savage disillusion and despair; at the other, Sterne deliberately cultivated illusion and gaiety in order to fence against the evils of this world. John-

son by self-discipline and will power maintained a difficult and perilous balance."

"Swift's melancholia is the melancholia of Hamlet, and its root is very much the same—a dichotomy of personality expressing itself in an abnormal sensitivity to the disparity between the world as it should be and the world as one sees it."

These passages give fairly enough the formula of Mr. Watkins's brief but distinctly ambitious critical study. The results are about what one could predict. His judgments concerning the central figure (Johnson) are orthodox and will be found generally acceptable, but in order to complete the symmetry of the scheme he has had to make Swift considerably more noble and Sterne considerably more wise than accepted verdict allows. Readers will probably have some skepticism themselves as to the absolute validity of theses which cause Mr. Watkins to accuse Cross of "wilful skepticism" and to declare that Quintana and Eddy are mistaken. But a reader does not, or at least should not, ask whether the formula, abstractly stated, is false or true. The formula is merely a device for grappling swiftly with the biography of three men and reducing parts of the evidence to order. The question is, does the impressionistic (Mr. Watkins calls it "partial") portrait which emerges seem, on the whole, lifelike? Or is the simplification (or distortion) so great that, though a fine work of art, one had better call it a fancy piece? By this test I think it will be generally agreed that Mr. Watkins has succeeded very well. I am really not at home in either Sterne or Swift, and can only record my impression that these chapters, in spite of their somewhat strenuous ingenuity, give a critical synthesis that any one can read with pleasure and that even a specialist can steal lecture material from. I should give that verdict with considerable confidence for the three chapters dealing with Johnson. Mr. Watkins has read the biographical sources widely and sensitively, and has shown a high degree of skill in making so large a number of quotations behave. There are some slips. Johnson did not ask himself whether he could ever *read* but whether he should ever *receive* the Sacrament with tranquillity (pp. 55, 57), Mr. Geoffrey Scott has shown beyond all doubt that Boswell did not ordinarily carry a notebook and that he did not take notes on the spot (*Private Papers of James Boswell*, vol. VI), I have pointed out the extreme improbability that Poll Carmichael was the prostitute whom Johnson carried home and sheltered (*Ibid.*, XVIII, 314), Sir John Hawkins's theory to account for Johnson's violent remorse of conscience was not a "rash assumption on the basis that Johnson knew intimately a man of dissolute morals," that is, Savage. Hawkins may have been mistaken, but he believed he had the evidence of Johnson's diary for his statement (*Private Papers*, XVI, 84). See my note printed on pp. 325-9 of this issue.

FREDERICK A. POTTLE

Yale University

A Concordance to the Poetry of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Edited by SISTER EUGENIA LOGAN, S. P. Saint Mary-of-the-Woods, Indiana 1940. Pp. xvi + 901. \$10 00

A Concordance to the Poems of Sidney Lanier, including the Poem Outlines and certain uncollected items By PHILIP GRAHAM and JOSEPH JONES. Austin. The University of Texas Press, 1939. Pp. vi + 447. \$3.50.

Let us say of Sister Eugenia Logan's work what must be said of a good concordance to a significant poet: it is a boon to all students of the poet and his age, and indeed of the English language and literature as a whole. No student of Coleridge dare risk omitting it from his workshop. After the text on which it is based, Ernest Coleridge's edition of his grandfather's poetry, 1912, the Concordance is the most important tool in that shop. It is not perfect, yet so helpful that I proceed to bury my adverse criticisms of the work in the middle of this review.

In the main, the variant readings are carefully noted. There is, however, too much repetition of identical lines from earlier and later versions of the same poem; for example, from *Osorio* and *Remorse*. Here a given line should have been recorded once, with two references to titles and places, for *The Dungeon* (from *Osorio*), three references are needed, and not merely a record of variant readings in this piece. As for omissions, Sister Eugenia has failed to note Miss Snyder's list of variant readings in a manuscript of *Kubla Khan* (*Times Literary Supplement*, London, Aug. 2, 1934), and she did not catch Coleridge's lines to his shaving-pot (in *William Blackwood and his Sons*, by Mrs. Oliphant, second edition, 1897, I, 421). Ernest Coleridge did not catch the amusing "Sonnet" (of 22 lines) either, neither text nor Concordance is much hurt by the loss.

In recording *I*, *mine*, and *my*, Sister Eugenia should have kept only the references to Coleridge himself. There are pages of *I* from *Osorio*, *Remorse*, *Zapolya*, and *The Fall of Robespierre*. Of misprints I note the following. Under *Dragon*, 'in' is omitted from *France* 57; under *Should*, for 'shoud' read 'should' in *Kubla Khan* 48, on the same page (684), for the head-word *Shouldered* read *Shouldered*. The worst thing I have found is a quotation for *Ambush* amid those for *Amber*. On page 112 there is disorder in the references under the head-word *Christ*, one-third the way through the quotations for it, this heading is repeated, and then followed by 'See *Anti-Christ*.' There should be reference back and forth between *Esthese*, one instance, and *S. T. C.*, of which there are six. And it would have been better in all such references across to depart from the usage of my Concordance to Wordsworth by printing "See also." The Index, p. 901, to "some significant

words occurring in the prefaces, notes, and glosses," is a welcome innovation.

There is less special interest in Coleridge's vocabulary than I thought a concordance would reveal; one reflects that, after all, but a small part of Coleridge's verse is of great importance. His store of words is not as huge as Mr. Lowes imagined, nor, apart from hyphenated compounds, are there as many strange words as Matthew Arnold once led me to expect. To a surprising extent the general run of Coleridge's words taken singly coincides with that of Wordsworth. Wordsworth's vocabulary is the larger, where I have compared the concordances, but not larger than might be anticipated from the larger bulk of his poems; he naturally mentions more things and names, and expresses more ideas, than does his brother-poet.

Some of Coleridge's favorite words were *fancy* (also with compounds), *fear*, *grief*, *holy*, *image*, *spell*, *spirit*. There are many occurrences of *murder* and cognate words. There are fewer references to *grief* and *grieve* than to *joy*, *joyous*, and *joys*. Some eight columns are devoted to *eye* and *eyes*. Most interesting are the compounds. Here are a few taken at random: *amber-glowing*, *boat-god* (Charon), *brother-blight*, *brother-murderer*, *canoe-boat*, *double-wreathed*, *doubt-mingled* (joy), *dragon-eyes*, *dragon-scales*, *dragon-wing'd*, *eye-poisons*, *flower-caressing*, *flower-embroider'd*, *flower-entangled*, *fog-smoke*, *gall-drops*, *giant-born*, *giant-limbs*, *glory-streaming*, *love-bright*, *monarch-murdered*, *pinky-silver*, *ram-devil*, *sabbath-breach*, *silver-bright*, *skiff-boat*, *star-bright*, *tyrant-murdered*, *under-garland*, *winter-bright*.

Sister Eugenia and her helpers are to be congratulated upon the boon she has given to this and succeeding generations. The book is handsome, the print is clear if necessarily small, and the paper, if a little thin, is likely to last if the volume is properly handled. The Dedication is taken from words of the Ancient Mariner:

To Mary Queen the praise be given

The concordance of Lanier is the second published concordance of an American author, the first having been that for Emerson, compiled by Hubbell (1932). I have heard of one in manuscript for Whitman, and wonder why there is none for Longfellow, who wrote more good poetry than any other American so far. Of course it is always wise for those who are driven to compile works of this sort to choose an earlier and better poet from European literature rather than any poet of this country or, say, Australia. Even in American poetry that of Lanier now seems rather thin. Yet one must not say so to Mr. Graham and Mr. Jones, but give thanks to them for a real gift to scholarship, since Lanier has a following of persons who wish to study him exactly. Now we can do that.

I note that the quotations for *God* occupy two and one-half of the double columns, also that Lanier is a Christian (see *Christ*), but not clearly a Trinitarian (see *Spuit* and *Ghost*). There are many references to *Dream*, *Dreamed*, *Dreamer*, *Dream-field*, *Dreaming*, *Dreams*, *Dream-taught*, *Dream-worker*, all told, about three columns of these words and their quotations. There are a good many hyphenated compounds, *Grain-army* seems to have a hyphen from the editors. In the "cross-references," as "See also Governor-spirits," or "Merchant-spirits," the compound words should be like the head-word, in black-faced types, which we need not give in this review. Lanier in his verse does not refer to Poe, Whitman, or Lee, nor to Wordsworth. There is a repeated line (*Clover* 81, 103). "Beethoven, Chaucer, Schubert, Shakespeare, Bach." These references to *Shakespeare* should have been combined with five others to *Shakspeare*. Naturally there are many references to *Marsh* and things connected with marshes. There are more to *Hills* than to *Mind*, which Lanier more often spells without a capital letter, and more to *Hills* than to *Nature*, which he deifies more often than he does *Mind*.

LANE COOPER

Cornell University

George Keate, Esq., Eighteenth Century English Gentleman. By KATHRYN GILBERT DAPP. Philadelphia, 1939. Pp viii + 184 (University of Pennsylvania dissertation)

Except for connoisseurship in pictures and improvement of grounds, George Keate appears to have exhibited every form of tasteful activity and literary fashion which a fairly affluent English gentleman living between 1730 and 1797 could be supposed to. In fact, so perfect a specimen is he that if he had been created by a novelist, he would seem improbable. For Miss Dapp's substantial bibliography of his works, all but a very few of which she has handled, for the letters and fragments of letters (the only one of Keate's which survives as a whole is one to Garrick), and for the information about her subject, Miss Dapp must indeed, as she says, have sought far and wide. A special reason for gratitude to her is her inclusion of the rest of the twenty-seven letters of Voltaire to Keate, now in the British Museum, of which only four have previously been printed. But the chief value of her study is an incredibly complete portrait of the Man of Taste.

Keate knew Edward Young and Voltaire, to both of whom he dedicated poems; Garrick and the elder Colman, who would not listen to his play, Angelica Kauffman, who painted for him; Sir Robert Strange; and Robert Adam (whose ceiling fell down on him

and caused a law-suit). He wrote letters to the Chevalier d'Eon and a poem in defence of Captain Bligh. He admired Shakespeare and had an inkstand from the mulberry tree. He met Dr. Johnson in the company of Boswell and Miss More. He read a Pickwickian paper on some doubtfully Roman pottery before the Society of Antiquaries. He exhibited at the Society of Artists, and Sir Joshua presented him with a Discourse. By his will, Nollekens (whom he knew) made his funerary bust.

Miss Dapp's bibliography of his work is, by implication, a review of the literary fashions of the period covered. Keate's Grand Tour produces a "respectful" view of ancient and modern Rome, a study of Geneva and Liberty, and a loco-descriptive poem, Miltonic, Thomsonian and Ossianic all in one, on the Alps, and though mountains were just then the rage in Paris, it is clear, as Professor Havens remarked in *The Influence of Milton*, that Keate really knew and loved *these* mountains. Next come an Ovidian amatory epistle, a graveyard piece on Netley Abbey (in Gray's elegiacs), praise of Shakespeare to Voltane (in time for the Jubilee), and the *Monument in Arcadia* (Poussin and pastoral, *ut pictura poesis*). The *Sketches from Nature* are purified and diluted Sterne. An *Account of the Pelew Islands* tells of Prince Lee Boo (as Professor Fairchild has recounted in *The Noble Savage*), inspires Mrs. West, Joseph Cottle, and even Coleridge to shed poetic tears, and runs to fifteen editions.

ELIZABETH W. MANWARING

Wellesley College

Letters of Dante Gabriel Rossetti to Fanny Cornforth. Edited by PAULL FRANKLIN BAUM. Baltimore, Maryland Johns Hopkins Press, 1940. Pp xiv + 142. \$2 25.

This correspondence adds another touch of irony to Rossetti's story, at last one finds him in actual communication with his mistress, the 'evil genius,' the wholly sensual influence in his life, that wrought such havoc according to his biographers. With trembling fingers one parts the veil.

Dear Fan

Dunn has told me something about which you must not be angry. It seems that poor fawn that Graham sent was in such a state as not to be worth the expense of sending on here, but that you, like a funny old chumpwump, would have it sent. So there is the whole story, you good old thing, and you must not be angry with Dunn or with me.

This sets the tone, and nowhere is there anything more passionate, the manner is exactly that of his letters to his mother, whom he called 'Good Antique.' Fanny is 'Good Elephant.' The

relationship was cosy and comfortable he consulted her about all his domestic affairs, and told her scraps of news about his 'dear old Mummy' and Christina. When Maria Rossetti became a Sister of Mercy, he explained. 'one of those old things whom you see going about in a sort of coal-scuttle and umbrella costume.'

These letters, which form a part of the Bancroft Collection in the Delaware Art Center, begin in 1870, and end in November, 1881. Mr Baum gives the date of Fanny's birth as 3 January 1824 (although on the next page he accepts Mr. Bancroft's version of her meeting with Rossetti in 1856, in which she is called 'a young girl' at that time), thus she was forty-six at the outset of this book, and the intimacy already a matter of fifteen years' standing. The importance of the letters is the revelation of Rossetti's dependence on her in her various capacities as housekeeper, seamstress, and even art-agent. The break which came in 1877 was on her initiative, not his, and he is almost abject in his appeals to John Schott, her partner in a public house and later her second husband, for news of her. Mr Schott's relations with them both were curious, and it is interesting to get the further light that this book gives, although more is needed to make the situation clear. Mr. Baum's editing is always helpful, he is, fortunately, more reliable than his sources, as out of the ten books he lists in his bibliography, eight are notoriously inaccurate and imaginative. However, information of any sort about Fanny Cornforth is difficult to find, a fact which makes the publication of these letters a matter of real moment to any student of Rossetti.

JANET CAMP TROXELL

New Haven, Connecticut

The Life and Letters of Henry Cuyler Bunner. By GERARD E. JENSEN. Durham: Duke University Press, 1939 Pp. xi + 248. \$3.00.

In the publication of American books and periodicals of the late nineteenth century New York was the conspicuous leader, publishing far more books than Boston and Philadelphia put together, one-fourth of all the periodicals in the country and two-thirds of the most widely circulated ones. Professor Mott estimates that between 1865 and 1885 the number of periodicals multiplied by more than four and one-half times and that in all eight or nine thousand periodicals were issued in these twenty years.¹ Very few, if any, of the swarm of magazine writers and editors of the period were more active or knew more fellow-authors than Henry Cuyler Bun-

¹ Frank Luther Mott, *A History of American Magazines, Volume III 1865-1885*, Harvard University Press, 1938, p. 5.

ner (1855-1896). Happily, Professor Jensen does not try to make of Bunner a major writer. He justifiably acknowledges him to have been a versatile and clever writer of familiar verse, influenced by Austin Dobson, he grants him skill and influence equal to that of Stockton and Aldrich in writing witty and polished short stories in miniature ("to be read while the candle burns"), and he sketches his successful career as editor for eighteen years of the first long-lived comic journal in the United States, the weekly *Puck* (1877-1918).

The book, however, is not important primarily as a biography or a critical interpretation of Bunner as a writer. It consists of a twelve-page biographical introduction, one hundred and fifty pages of selected Bunner letters arranged chronologically with interspersed annotations supplied by Professor Jensen, and five concluding essays: "Bunner's Character," "The Man of Letters," "The Poet," "The Editor," and "The Short-Story Writer." Chapters I, II, XVI, and XVII could be omitted without significant loss. The remaining portions, especially the annotated letters, introduce the reader to a multitude of minor writers (mostly of New York) of the late nineteenth century—men like Brander Matthews, Stedman, Lathrop, Gilder, Stockton, Julian Hawthorne, Warner, Gibson, Cable, Riley, Hutton, etc. The reader who will supplement the biography with Matthews' *These Many Years* (1917), *Life and Letters of Edmund Clarence Stedman* (1910), Gilder's *Letters* (1916), and E. P. Mitchell's *Memoirs of an Editor* (1924) will be richly rewarded.

The chief value of Professor Jensen's book is to be derived from the many instructive details it contains about a prolific minor writer, and, more important, the incidental information it gives about Bunner's numerous literary associates. This information is not sufficient or coherent enough to make the book, by itself, a literary history of New York during the third quarter of the nineteenth century; nevertheless, it is one contribution toward such a history, which probably cannot be adequately written until at least half a dozen other writers of the time and place have been similarly treated.

HERMAN E. SPIVEY

University of Florida

BRIEF MENTION

The Growth of Literature, vol III By H. M. and N. K. CHADWICK. Cambridge. at the University Press [New York Macmillan], 1940 Pp. xxvi + 928 \$9.00. With the present volume Professor and Mrs. Chadwick finish a monumental survey of "oral

literature" in many languages, a survey running to more than 2,400 closely printed pages Vol I (1932, see *MLN*, XLIX, 438 f.) was devoted to "the ancient literatures of Europe," Greek, Germanic and Celtic, vol II (1936, see *MLN*, LIII, 235 f.) dealt with Russian oral literature, Yugoslav oral poetry, and early Hindu and Hebrew literature, vol III takes up the oral literature of the Tartars, and of certain Polynesian and African peoples, and includes, besides, a 12-page "note on English ballad poetry" and a 207-page "general survey" in which all the material considered in the three volumes is reviewed afresh. On the other hand, no general index is provided, each volume has its own. Now that the work is done, one feels more than ever that its title is unhappy. In this *magnum opus*, the authors are not concerned with literature in the ordinary sense, they examine "speakings" rather than writings. Nor are they primarily concerned with any process of growth, they describe, analyze and classify their material first of all, and in most cases they do no more. Certainly they do not tell the story of the growth of literature, the promise of their title remains unfulfilled. But we must not hold this against them. We are too deeply in their debt for that. They have given us a systematic account of a vast body of material, old and new, an account which we can use in our study of writings as well as in our further study of "speakings." In particular, their huge collection of examples, gleaned from many parts of the earth, will correct the perspective of the specialist and broaden his horizon. The authors have spent nearly twenty years on their gigantic task. The time was well spent. We congratulate them on an achievement of the first rank.

K M.

An Analysis of the Long Prayers in Old French Literature with Special Reference to the 'Biblical-Creed-Narrative' Prayers. By SISTER MARIE PIERRE KOCH. Dissertation of the Catholic University of America, Washington, 1940. Pp 204. Patiente étude collectionnant toutes les longues 'prières épiques' (prières-credo) dans la littérature narrative du moyen âge français (42 exemples dans 62 textes considérés)—un travail analogue avait été entrepris par une autre élève de la Catholic University pour l'ancien espagnol. Quand Sister Marie Pierre affirme: "no serious study of length has been done on the long prayers in Old French . . .," elle semble ignorer les discussions, s'étendant sur les années de 1931 à 1934 (quatre articles dans *ZRPh*), entre M. Scheludko et moi. Au moins pour le travail de mon contradicteur, je me permettrais de revendiquer l'épithète "sérieux," puisqu'il me semble avoir définitivement élucidé et le problème de la source de ces prières épiques (des prières d'exorcisation latines, parallèles à la *commendatio animae* et remontant à une tradition très ancienne dans la chrétienté) et celui de la transformation artistique que les poètes

ont fait subir à ces textes assez sommaires (d'après M. Scheludko le poète du *Couronnement Louis* serait le premier en date à donner la richesse des détails aux listes de miracles divins) Sister Maie Pierre cite, d'une façon plus vague, quelques-uns de ces textes et insiste sur le caractère gallican de cette "popular devotion" (les prières épiques manquant en allemand)—ce qui ne me paraît pas encore suffisamment prouvé.

LEO SPITZER

CORRESPONDENCE

LOCOMOTIVE ET AUTOMOBILE E. Leich, "Aristoteles, die Lokomotive und das Automobil" *Studia neophilologica*, XII, 3 (Upsal 1940), p. 210-236. Sous ce titre sentant un peu le journalisme, M. Leich réussit à expliquer les mots techniques modernes en dernier lieu par le terme aristotélicien *τὸ κινητικὸν κατὰ τόπον* 'la faculté de mouvement' (donnée aux animaux et à l'homme au contraire des plantes et des minéraux), que S. Thomas d'Aquin rend par *motivum secundum locum*, Oresme par *la (puissance) motive de lieu en autre* et l'humaniste Argyropoulos par *loco motivum* (avec un ablatif *loco* = 'selon le lieu') en Angleterre on avert parlé au XVII^e siècle de la *locomotive faculty* (*power*) comme en France au XVI^e de la *faculté locomotive*—c'est en Angleterre que *locomotive engine* (opposé à *stationary engine*) se trouve depuis la découverte de la locomotion par la vapeur (1815), et le mot abrégé *locomotive* depuis 1829. Les autres pays suivent. La (*voiture*) *automobile* suit la *locomobile*, mot formé d'après *locomotive*, et le préfixe *auto-* vient du mot *automate*, attesté d'abord dans Rabelais. *Autobus* est d'abord une formation anglaise.

Je crois que le transfert *locomotive faculty* > *locomotive engine* ne s'explique pas seulement par l'idée de la locomotion commune à l'homme (selon la définition aristotélicienne) et à la nouvelle machine, mais aussi par la notion de *force agissante* qu'exprimait l'épithète *locomotive*. Il faut se rappeler que *power* lui-même a en anglais (depuis 1671) le sens de 'machine qui transforme une énergie en force mécanique' (de là *power plant*, *power house* pour les institutions urbaines qui produisent l'électricité et le gaz, mots traduits en all. sous la forme de *Kraftanlage*). Je suppose donc que *locomotive engine* est un abrégé (peut-être seulement mental) de **locomotive power-engine*—l'expression puriste de l'all. *Kraftwagen* offre un témoignage valide à cette supposition. A noter qu'en Allemagne le mot *Wagen* (comme en anglais *car*) tend à supplanter dans la parlure courante *Auto*, qui devient de plus en plus une voiture publique (comme le *taxi*) on dira *wir fahren mit dem (unserem) Wagen dorthin*. L'aversion contre les mots savants est évidemment plus forte en Allemagne et en Angleterre qu'en France (cf. *(Fahr)rad*—*bicyclette*).

Je crois que la spécialisation de *locomobile* pour des machines travaillant sur place (alors qu'encore en 1869 la *locomobile routière* alterne avec la *locomotive routière*) s'explique par une retraduction latinisante de 'sur

place' en *loco*- (cf *loco* = 'en ville') j'ai montré dans *Le fr mod*, VIII, pour *photogénique*, comment le rapport des deux membres d'une composition savante est souvent réinterprété selon des besoins nouveaux se faisant sentir dans la communauté parlante.

L'objection de M. L. contre *automobile* consistant à meir à *mobile* le sens de 'ce qui se meut,' est évidemment erronée. Little a en premier lieu l'explication de *mobile* 'qui se meut ou qui peut être mû' (*garde, couleur mobile* etc.), de même en all on se sert du mot d'emprunt *mobil* p. ex. à propos d'un vieillard encore remuant. Les philosophes anciens avaient déjà cette conception, v. Lalande, *Voc de la phil*, s. v. *mobile* 'ce qui peut être mû'—Spécialement, chez Aristote, toute chose est appelée *mobile* (*κινούμενον*) en tant qu'elle change et *moteur* (*κινούν*) en tant qu'elle cause le changement. Le *premier mobile* (*πρῶτον κινούμενον*, L. *primum mobile*) est le ciel supérieur, ou "premier ciel," qui est à son tour le moteur de tout ce qui existe dans le monde." Lachelier ajoute qu'un texte d'Aristote distingue un moteur immobile (*ἀκίνητον*) objet du désir, un mobile qui devient à son tour moteur (*τὸ κινούν καὶ κινούμενον*), le désir, enfin un mobile simplement tel (*κινούμενον*), notre corps. L'automobile est au fond, au sens aristotélicien, un mobile-moteur, un *κινούν καὶ κινούμενον*, puisque mouvant et mû (par une force qui la pousse, soit sur le plan physique, par le 'moteur,' soit sur le plan humain, par notre désir). Le préfixe *auto-* tire d'*automate* (terme grec lui-même *τὸ αὐτόματον* au sens moderne se trouve déjà chez Héron, cf Lalande) est dû à une illusion volontaire de l'homme qui fait semblant d'avoir construit, espèce de Dieu, une machine indépendante de lui. L'automate est un 'appareil imitant par un mécanisme intérieur les mouvements d'un être vivant,' dit Lalande. L'*automobile* tend à réunir deux conceptions diamétralement opposées le mobile-moteur et l'automate—*automate* n'aurait pas contenté l'homme moderne en voie de dénommer un appareil qui change de place. Le préfixe *auto-* si humain et si volontaire (*autonomie, autocratie*, etc.) insufflait une volonté propre à la machine, le membre *-mate* mécanique devait tomber. Le terme *automobile* est donc un document excellent de cette attitude du créateur admirant béatement sa création, qu'est l'homme technique moderne.

Le nom de l'*Automobile-Club de France* (fondé en 1895) est évidemment un anglicisme, comme le suggère dubitativement M. Leich à la note 2 de la p. 226 mais le modèle direct n'est pas *Modern Cinéma, Athletic Club*, etc., mais plus particulièrement le *Touring-Club de France* (je trouve dans E. Bonnaffé, *Dict des Anglicismes*, une *Revue du Touring-Club de France* en 1891).

Le neutre de l'all *das Auto* s'expliquera non seulement par l'analogie phonétique de *das Kilo, das Piano*, mais par le prédécesseur immédiat de l'automobile *das (Fahr)rad (Bicycle, Velo)*. L'anglicisme du mot *autobus* (que soutient aussi Abel Hermant, "Chroniques de Lancelot," 1933, p. 123) me semble aussi appuyé par le fait que les *porte-manteau words* sont un des traits caractéristiques de la langue anglaise.

A ajouter à l'histoire des formations avec le préfixe *auto-* les remarques de M. Mighorini dans *Arch glott et* XXVII (1935), p. 15

Modern Language Notes

Volume LVI

JUNE, 1941

Number 6

"OR EST VENUZ QUI AUNERA": A MEDIEVAL DICTUM

In Chrétien de Troyes' romance on Lancelot, the well-known *Roman de la charrete*, there is a striking version of the Three Days' Tournament in which Lancelot reveals his complete subservience to Arthur's queen, Guenevere. Professor Cross and I have discussed this episode in our book (*Lancelot and Guenevere*), and it is unnecessary to dwell here on its significance for any real understanding of the nature of Courtly Love (*amour courtois*). My object now is to bring out a detail which is of importance in understanding Chrétien's art of composition.

When the Tournament is announced the herald recognizes Lancelot, though the latter requests him not to make the fact known. So the herald restricts himself to the following words, which I quote in their context: .

" Or est venuz qui aunera !
Or est venuz qui aunera ! "
Ice crioit [MS C] par tot li garz,
Et janz saillent de totes parz,
Si li demandent que il crie,
Cil n'est tant hardiz que le die,
Ainz s'an va criant ce meismes
Et sachiez que dit fu lprs primes .
" Or est venuz qui aunera ! "
Nostre mestre an fu li hira
Qui a dire le nos aprist,
Car il premieremant le dist.

Most Romance scholars will recollect that it was Gaston Paris who in his fundamental article on the *Charrete* (*Romania* 12 [1883], 480n.) said: "Il semble résulter de ce passage que Chrétien était

héraut d'armes Ce *nous* n'a guère de sens s'il ne s'applique à l'auteur lui-même associé aux autres hérauts; il paraît difficile de croire que ce cri ait été poussé, au temps de Chrétien, par d'autres que les hérauts." This view, I may remark at once, interesting as it is, has not been generally accepted. In his edition of the poem Foerster quotes the words of Paris but comments (p. 411) on them as follows: "Vielleicht genügt es aber, blos anzunehmen, dass *nous* hier allg. 'wir, die jetzt Lebenden, die Zeitgenossen' bedeutet. Uebrigens dürfte das zuschauende Publikum sich an diesen Rufen der Herolde wohl mitbeteiligt haben" I happen, in this instance, to agree with Foerster, but in doing so I am merely expressing an opinion; and certainly, had we only this passage to go by, Paris' contrary opinion might still be valid.

But the expression *Or est venuz qui aunera* has a proverbial ring to it which suggests that Chrétien de Troyes did not invent the expression. All that we know is that he was the first writer of fiction to make of the expression a tournament 'cry.' As we shall see in a moment, the subject of the phrase, "Now he has come who will measure off," is Death,¹ not primarily Lancelot, to whom the herald is referring and whom he wishes his listeners to identify with Death. I owe the suggestion for this explanation to Margery Ellis, *A Catalogue of the Proverbs of Chrétien de Troyes*, a Master's dissertation accepted by the University of Chicago in 1927. Miss Ellis' fascinating little study was prepared under the supervision of the late T. Atkinson Jenkins and is a testimony, which we should not forget, of the excellence of his instruction. It should be brought up to date and published. Meantime, I take the liberty of quoting one or two passages from it.

In Miss Ellis' *Catalogue* our expression is listed as No. 32. She has found it in Morawski's *Proverbes français antérieurs au xiv^e siècle* (Paris, 1925), and she observes (p. 38) with regard to it:

It seems to mean "Behold, the conqueror comes."

She then adds:

It was apparently traditional at tournaments. Gaston Paris found two later examples of its use (*Romania* 16 [1887], 100, and 32 [1903], 442).

The first, in the *Recueil de chants historiques français*, I, 264, as follows:

¹ For further definition see below Note 2

Hugue Ubriot, bien me recors
Quant fus prevost premierement
Que j'oi a cris et a cors
Dire de ton avenement.
" Bien viegne par qui haultement
Des or justice regnera.
Or est venu qui l'aunera "

And the second, in the *Moralité de Charité*, a drama, in which the Fool² seeing Death approach—and that is the significant fact, which Miss Ellis failed to stress—cries out twice.³

" Il est venu qui aunera." *Anc. Th. fran.* III, 413.

It must now be clear that the proper subject of *Qui* in the expression *Or est venuz qui aunera*⁴ is the grim reaper himself, namely, *Mor* or Death. The *Moralité* preserves the original, correct meaning. Chrétien de Troyes expected his readers to supply this meaning, which he assumed they knew. But what about the word *aunera*? The Tob.-Lom. Dictionary (s. v. *auner*) translates correctly "mit der Elle messen"; and it is of course Death that measures the space his victim is finally to occupy. Hence, properly rendered, the passage in the *Charrete* means: "Behold! Death comes who will measure off your grave." This signifies that Lance-

² From the passages I have quoted it would appear that we are dealing with a *dicton* (dictum) rather than a proverb, the meaning of which (I owe the suggestion for this to Professor E. C. Armstrong) depended on the circumstances. In the passage on Hugue Ubriot it would be "Now justice or law will reign he who will mete it out has come." In *Charrete* and the *Moralité* it would be "Now Fate or Death will prevail he who will mete it out has come." As Professor Leo Spitzer reminds me, Chrétien in vv 5698 ff. has himself applied it to Lancelot (5702, *Cist n'aunera hui mes*), thus giving a roguish turn to his interpretation.

³ In the Tarot playing cards the Fool regularly goes under the name of *Matto* or *Mat* and is the symbol of Fate. But Death is there represented by another card, no. 13. It should be pointed out that W. H. Willshire (*Descriptive Catalogue of Playing and Other Cards in the British Museum*, 1867, I, 9, II, 143) is mistaken, as Spitzer says, in connecting *Matto* with ' [check]-mate ' (Spanish *matar*), see REW 5401.

On the other hand, there seems to be no doubt that the knave of clubs designated as "Lancelot" on the French playing cards of about 1486 (see Willshire, Vol II [1877], Plate XVIII) is our Lancelot of the Lake.

⁴ The word *alne* as a measure occurs as early as the *Roland* (Jenkins, 2400):

Ne void tere ne alne ne plein piet
Que nen i ait o Franceis o paien.

lot is the conquering hero, as Miss Ellis states; but Chrétien does not say so, he leaves his readers to draw that conclusion.

As for Chrétien's use of proverbs and proverbial expressions, Miss Ellis has this to say.

The medieval school boy,⁵ having acquired the fundamentals of Latin grammar by the age of eleven, needed an easy reading text before beginning the study of Latin literature, his own teacher usually composed such a text, following a traditional model which included fables, folk-lore and proverbs, both Biblical and popular. The *Fecunda Ratis*, written between 1022 and 1024 by Egbert, a "submagister" of Liège, was a particularly successful reader of this type. In order that the material might be progressively difficult, the author began with single phrases and advanced to paragraphs of as much as twenty lines, the first 595 lines consist of proverbs and epigrams. If we may believe the author's claim, he was the first to write down those epigrammatic sayings of the "rusticus" which had existed theretofore only in oral tradition. At any rate, his text seems to have initiated a vogue for such collections: during the next three centuries many were compiled, including popular, Latin and Biblical sayings. A frequent exercise in the medieval school was to translate proverbs into Latin verse, the pupil was first allowed two lines for his translation, but must then condense it into a single line. Some of the proverbs thus condensed are hardly recognizable.

About 1175 an unknown protégé of Philip of Flanders assembled a large number of popular proverbs, prefixed a sixain applying or explaining it, and concluded with the refrain "Ce dist li vilain." This collection [edited by Tobler in 1895], known as *Le Proverbe au Vilain*, survives in many manuscripts. Chrétien uses fourteen of its proverbs [not including our *dicton*]. He must have been familiar with the work, and may even have been associated with the author of Philip's court at the time of its composition.

Chrétien's works contain some fifty-six proverbs—according to Miss Ellis. Her study confirms what Faral (*Arts poétiques*) had discovered with regard to the technique he applied to them.

Thus Miss Ellis' little treatise enables us to see that Chrétien was not employing a new procedure. He was using a common expression or *dicton* according to an established medieval practice.⁶ Certainly there is no good reason to suppose that he himself

⁵ Cf. now Lynn Thorndike, *Speculum* 15 (1940), 406, on the school at Troyes in the twelfth century.

⁶ I might add that it was Tobler (*ZRP.* 11 [1887], 430) who first pointed out that the expression does not mean, as Paris thought, "voilà qui parcourra la lice, comme s'il aurait ou mesurait de sa lance," but "Wollenstoff seines Kleides mit der Elle messen" and then "prugeln."

was a "tournament" herald.⁷ It appears probable that he was a 'cleric,' versed in the methods of the medieval schools. In fact, the *Christianus, canonicus Sancti Lupi*, found by Vignerat in a charter of Troyes, dated 1173 (*MP* 32 [1935], 343-53), is much more likely to have been the Champagne poet than anyone thus far proposed. In any case, the meaning of the passage in Chrétien's *Charrete* seems to me perfectly clear.

WILLIAM A. NITZE

University of Chicago

AN EIGHTH *VENJANCE ALIXANDRE*

During the past fifteen years, the *Elliott Monographs* have dealt fully with the seven known French versions of the punishment of the murderers of Alexander the Great. The mediaeval vogue of this episode is attested by its survival in twenty-four different manuscripts. It is consequently useful to complete the record with the text of an eighth version, recently discovered in the mid-fifteenth-century *Fleur des Histoures* of Jean Mansel.

In the employ of Philip the Good, Mansel very naturally based his Alexander story on the adaptation prepared for the Burgundian ducal court by Jean Wauquelin between 1444 and 1448. Mansel is to be commended for reducing his *Venjançe Alixandre* to about one-ninth the length of the poem written by Jehan le Nevelon in the twelfth century and set to prose by Wauquelin. Incidentally, Wauquelin's direct reference to the original poem is omitted by Mansel, so that no new evidence comes to light concerning the proper spelling of the name *Nevelon*.

On the basis of G. de Poerck's *Introduction à la Fleur des Histoures de Jean Mansel* (Ghent, 1936), the Mansel *Venjançe* would exist only in manuscript 6361 (fonds français) of the Bibliothèque

'beat up' A third passage referring to *auner* from the *Roman de Ham* adds nothing to our knowledge of Chrétien

⁷ In *Yvain* 2204, Chrétien again refers to a herald

nes li hera

Qui des vaillanz crie le ban,

on this see Foerster's note (p. 300) and Huon de Mery, *Torneiement de l'Antechrist* (ed. Tarbé, 1851), pp. 68, 69, and 70.

Nationale. While mentioning the episode merely by title and without comment of any sort, de Poerck describes the other Mansel manuscripts in such a way as to exclude the *Vengeance* from all except Mazarine 1562, Chantilly 730, and Bibliothèque Nationale (fonds français) 679-80. Photostats and correspondence (interrupted, to be sure, by the war) indicate beyond fair doubt that neither these manuscripts nor Brussels 9231 have included the *Vengeance* chapter.

The text given below is contained in the last chapter of Part V of the first volume of the *Fleurs des Histoires* (fols 420a-421d). At the end of each paragraph, the corresponding sections in Wauquelin are given according to the numbering in *Elliott Monograph* 34 (pp. 59-75). In so short an excerpt, it is not possible from readings to determine the particular Wauquelin manuscript consulted by Mansel, nor are dialectal considerations of any assistance.

Concerning Mansel's language and style, it should be observed that even the few years which separate his adaptation from Wauquelin reflect a tendency toward modernization which is not without elegance. Certain similes and other details which lend color even to the ponderous awkwardness in Wauquelin's narrative are no longer in evidence. Mansel is not interested in the engines of war so carefully enumerated by Wauquelin in §§ 11-12, nor does he trouble himself about comparisons with the *beste mue que on ochist en son estable* (13), *ceulx qui font le poirier* (16), the traditional *chine qui chante devant sa mort* (21), or the boiling of the *faulx monnoier* (23). Mansel no longer cares about the many times Candasse and Alexander had enjoyed *grant societé et compaignie en aucuns secrez lieux* (3), nor is he concerned with the stones and flowers which Florent and Dan Clyn chop away from each other's armor (32). The bronze ox in which the traitors are finally punished is equipped, according to Mansel, only with *pointes de fer agues*, whereas Wauquelin is careful to say that these instruments of torture are *brocques de fer a maniere d'allennes* (41). On the other hand, the traitors seek sanctuary, according to Wauquelin, in a simple *temple*, whereas Mansel calls this a *temple a garand* (40). Wauquelin specifies that Alexander's avengers hurl the bodies of prisoners back into Rocheflour by an *engien que on appelle une perrierre*, while Mansel is satisfied with a mere *coullart* (19). As an aid to torture, Wauquelin talks of *mouisses que on appelle ez*

(4³), which becomes mere *mousches* at the hands of Mansel: a point of interest in connection with the disappearance of OFr *ez* (Lat. *apis*) as discussed by Gillieron (*Généalogie des mots qui désignent l'abeille*) and with present-day regional use of *mouche à miel* for *abeille* (cf. the chart for this word in the *Atlas Linguistique*). Lastly, where Wauquelin uses the familiar mediaeval locution *en ralla chascun a sa cascune* (43), Mansel substitutes the more modern (but less colorful) phrase *s'en ralerent chascun en son lieu*.

While it is to be presumed that Mansel wrote in a northern dialect, the manuscript utilized below shows but few regional spellings: the feminine pronoun *le* 6, *acompaigned* 7, *saige* 10, *dommage* 22, *garentur* 29, *aproça* 31, *renderont* 33, 35, *charr* 41. Mansel avoids the conjunction *part que* (= 'où que') 11, but introduces *par si que* (33) in the sense of 'si.'

La royne Candasse, acertenée de la mort Alixandre et comment Antipater et ses enfans l'eurent empoisonné, elle fut tant dolante que plus ne pouoit. Et dist l'istore que ceste royne eult eu ung filz de Alixandre (fol 420b). Le filz eult a nom Alior, beau damoiseil fut, fort et hardy. (3)

Sa mere l'appella et lui dist une fois comment il estoit filz du roy Alixandre qui fut le plus noble roy du monde, en le enortant qu'il vouldist sa mort venger et moustrer qu'il estoit de son sang yssus. L'enfant respondit qu'il estoit prest de faire tout ce qu'elle lui vouldroit commander (4)

La royne doncques, veant comment les barons du roy Alixandre se entrebatoient, se proposa que elle en rapaiserait aucuns, comme elle fist, car elle rapaisa Ptholomer et Aristé qui eurent esmeu une grosse guerre l'un contre l'autre, et fist tant que tous deux vindrent en son ayde chascun a xxx^m combatans. Puis fist encores qu'elle eult en son ayde Danchus et Anthiocus qui lui menerent chascun xxx. mille hommes. Elle eult aussi Lichanor et Philotas, qui eurent en leur compaignie pres de cinquante mille hommes (5)

Quant la royne Candasse Cleophis veit le noble secours que iceulx lui eurent admené, grant joye eult a son cuer. Elle eult ensemble toute sa compaignie assemblée et le chargea a son filz Alior. Puis le mist en la garde des barons dessus nommez, qui en eurent grant feste, pour ce que oncques chose ne ressembloit mieulx a l'autre qu'il ressembloit Alixandre son pere. (6)

Quant tout leur appareil fut prest de mouvoir, la royne, accompagnée de ses autres filz, admonnesta (fol. 420c) moult iceulx barons qu'ilz se vouldissent employer a venger la mort de leur noble roy. Ilz lui respondirent que ce feroient ilz volentiers, puis se mirent au chemin. Et tant errerent qu'ilz entrerent en la terre de Antipater, et commencerent a courre en pays et a ardoir et pillier villes et fortresses (7-9)

Pour lesquelles nouvelles Antipater fut moult esbahy et dolans. Ses enfans manda et tout son pouoir, et fist fortifier sa principale cité que on nommoit Rochefleur pour soy retraire se besoing en avoit, et se fist tresbien garnir de vivres et de tous habillemens de guerre. Entre ses filz en y eult ung nommé Florent, qui fut le plus saige et le plus vaillant des aultres, auquel Antipater bailla la conduite de tout son ost. Puis se mirent aux champs pour rencontrer leurs ennemis (10-12)

Maint rencontre et mainte escarmuche eurent les ungs aux autrez a grant perte. Mais finalement il convint Florent retraire dedens Rochefleur, en laquelle cité Alor les assiega de toutes pars. Ses engiens appareilla pour les assaillir et y fist maint dommages, puis se prindrent a remplir les fossez pour entrer dedens. Quant ceulx de la cité veirent ce, ilz se mirent tous en armes, aimans mieulx a morir sur les champs que dedens la cité. Puis issirent sur leurs ennemis et les envayrent tresaignement. Mais ce fut a leur grant dommage, car ilz y perdirent grant partie de leurs hommes, car mesmes Florent y fut tresgriefment navrez et (fol. 420d) se y fut prins ung nommé Cassandam qui cuida avoir rué jus Danchus, mais il ne peut, ains l'attaint Danchus si durement en son escu d'un espieu fort et roide qu'il le rua par terre les jambes levees et fut prins et retenus. (12-16)

Après ceste desconfiture, les barons de l'ost se mirent ensemble a conseil pour savoir de quelle mort ilz feroient morir Cassandam, pour ce qu'ilz furent advertis que ce fut celui qui porta le venin en Babillonne dont Alixandre morut. si que pour vengeance de ce meffait ilz le firent desvestir tout nud et le lyerent de chaines de fer a une estache, puis le firent tourner au feu comme ung chappon, et en ce point le firent morir. Et puis ilz prindrent son corps ainsi rosti et le mirent en ung coullart avecques aucuns chevaliers qu'ilz eurent prins et les firent jecter en la cité, dont ceulx de dedens furent fortment espantez, car par ce congurent ilz que en leurs ennemis ne trouveroient aucune mercy. (18-19)

En celle cité de Rochefleur si estoit venus en l'ayde de Antipater le roy de Honguerie, qui estoit son parent, et ung aultre grant baron nommé Tesson, nepveu de Florent. Et avoient admené .xxxiii Hongrois. Ceulx yssirent ung jour sur leurs ennemis en tresbonne ordonnance, et les assaillirent par tresgrant fierté. Mais ce fut a leur tresgrant dommage, car tous deux y furent prins et leurs hommes mis a desconfiture. Quant la bataille fut passee, les barons de l'ost fist[re]nt prendre le roy de (fol. 421a) Honguerie et le firent boullir en une chaudiere sur le feu, la ou il fina sa vie a grant misere. Puis firent Tesson derompre a quatre chevaulx. Tous les aultres prisonniers, de quelque estat qu'ilz feussent, firent pendre au plus pres de la cité ou despit de ceulx de dedens (20-23)

Au chief de trois mois après celle desconfiture, ceulx de l'ost, veans que par une riviere ceulx de dedens pouoient aler et venir jusques a la mer et admener vivres et aultres biens, firent faire ung grant pont au travers de celle riviere, et firent tendre bonnes chaines de fer si qu'il n'estoit nef qui par la peust passer. Ainsi doncques par ce moyen la moitié de l'ost passa la riviere et fut la cité advironnee tout entour. (24-25)

Lors furent en grant soussy ceulx de dedens et veirent bien que ilz furent venus a leur fin. Mainte plainte y fut faicte et maint gémissement. Mais Florent, qui ne cessoit de ses hommes reconforter, fist une fois armer de ses gens les plus fors et les plus rades, et s'en issy si soudainement que ceulx de l'ost ne s'en donnerent garde jusques qu'ilz furent venus sur eulx. A ce costé faisoit lors Aristé le guet, lequel pour ses hommes garentir s'enforça de tout son pouoir et rebouta ses ennemis. Mais si avant se bouta qu'il y fut prins et menez dedens la cité, dont Antipater eult grant joye. (26-29)

Or advint que Florent, qui eult prins si bon prisonnier, ne fut pas content, ains se lança plus avant contre ses ennemis, qui (fol. 421b) estoient ja presque tous en armes. Contre lui vint Ptholomer assez fierement, mais Florent l'ataint si durement qu'il le porta par terre griefment navré, si qu'il le convint reporter en sa tente. Danchus, qui trop en eult grant duel, s'aproça de Florent et de leurs espees s'entredonnerent si grans cops qu'il sembloit qu'ilz se deussent entretuer a chascun cop, car tous deux furent fors et vaillans. Mais finalement Danchus hasta Florent de si pres que, voulzist Florent ou non, il le porta par terre et le print prisonnier. (30-32)

Après la prinse de Florent tous ses hommes s'en fuirent en la cité. Ne tarda gueres après que Antipater envoya quatre de ses barons en l'ost pour demander Florent par si qu'il leur renderoit Aristé. Tant fut parlé de ceste besongne que tous deux furent delivrez a leurs gens. (33-34)

Puis fist Antipater parler de la paix, mais Alor et son conseil ne s'i vouldrent consentir, si non que Antipater se meist en la voullenté du dit Alor et tous leurs biens; dont Antipater ne fut pas content, ains dist par grant ire que aïnois moroient il tous en la paine et lui et les siens qu'il s'accordast a une telle paix, et que ja a ung bastard filz de bastard il ne se renderoit par telle condicion. (35)

Pour laquelle responce Alor jura par tous ses dieux que jamais paix n'en seroit faite jusques qu'il avroit occis Antipater et tous ceulx qui consentans furent de la mort du noble roy Alixandre son pere. Et lors en la presence des ambassadeurs, Alor donna a ung sien frere la cité de Antipater, et les avoires (fol. 421c) d'icelle donna il aux barons de son ost. Pour ceste responce s'en retournerent les ambassadeurs en la cité tous confus et esbahis, et reciterent a Antipater tout ce qu'ilz eurent veu et oy. (35-36)

De lors en avant, ilz se ordonnerent a bien deffendre leur cité. De l'autre part, ceulx de dehors firent crier a l'assault et se prindrent a remplir les fossez, a traire, a jecter et a assailir par si grant force qu'il n'y eult si hardi en la cité qui osast la teste metre aux cresteaulx. Toutesvoies, ceulx de dedens se deffendirent si vaillamment qu'ilz ne furent pas emportez de tel assault ne du second. (37-39)

Mais finalement ilz se trouverent si las et si oppressez qu'ilz furent emportez d'assault et furent illec mis a mort, hommes, femmes et enfans, qui furent trouvez durant la fureur de leurs ennemis. Antipater et ses enfans se deffendirent longuement, puis s'en fuirent a ung temple a garand,

ouquel ilz furent prins et mis en prison, jusques ad ce que Alior aïroit conclut de quelle mort il les feroit morir (39-40)

Or fut la conclusion telle que Antipater fut jugiés a estre mis en ung boef d'arain tout plain de pointes de fer agues pour lui derompre toute sa chair. Encores desoubz le boef, qui ne cessoit de soy mouvoir par ung engien qui y fut fait, firent ilz faire ung tresgrant feu, et fina ilec sa vie povrement le maleureux Antipater (41)

Aucuns en y eult qui furent tous vifz escorchés, puis furent oings de miel et mis aux mousches. Aucuns en y eult qui furent pendus et occis par (fol. 421d) divers tourmens, tant que en moins de deux ans tous les consentans de la mort du roy Alixandre si furent destruis si que ung seul n'en eschappa. (42)

Aprés laquelle destruction le roy Alior paia et contenta tresbien tous les barons qui l'eurent servy et leur offry a tousjours mais son corps et sa puissance; puis s'en ralerent chascun en son lieu. Et treuve l'en par les istores que en plus peu de XIII ans tous les barons du roy Alixandre furent mors et occis par batailles et par sedicions, par la grant envie qu'ilz eulrent les ungs aux aultres, qui fut une chose de tresmauvais exemple. Ainsi finit l'istore du trespuissant roy Alixandre (43-44)

EDWARD B. HAM

Yale University

OLD FRENCH *ASSIET*

The Old French dictionary of Tobler-Lommatzsch records one example of *assiet* (noun, masc.) but refrains from giving a definition of it,¹ and merely reproduces the passage (3 verses) from the fabliau *La Veuve*² in which it occurs. Let us cite at greater length the passage from Scheler's text (A):

- 77 Et puis me vint en mon avis,
 Mais je le conte mult envis,
 Chaiens venoit .l. colenbraus,
 K₁ mult estoit et gens et biaux,
 K₁ s'aseioit dedens mon soing,
 82 Et cest *assiet* refaisoit soing,
 Mais ne sai que ce senefie

Scheler's interpretation of verse 82 (*op. cit.*, p. 339) is repeated

¹ Tobler-Lommatzsch, *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch*, Berlin, 1925-, I, 595b

² As published by A. Scheler, *Trouvères belges du XIII^e au XIV^e siècle*, Bruxelles, 1876, I, 225 f. Scheler's text is that of ms. Turin LV 32 which we shall call A.

by Tob.-Lom. "Et cette circonstance me donnait également à réfléchir," but is accepted only with reserve as is shown by the question mark placed after it. Scheler says of *assiet*. "subst. verbal de *asseoir*, donc action de s'asseoir."³ An objection to Scheler's interpretation is that *assiet*, which he considers to be subject of *refaisoit*, is not in the nominative case, for the text (ms. A) which he publishes adheres rigorously elsewhere to the old two-case system.

The variants of a second manuscript (B)⁴ will help us clear up these difficulties and explain *assiet*. The verses in B, corresponding to 81-82 of Scheler's text (A) read:

S1 m'avaloit ens en mon sain,
S1 refaisoit cel *aisié* sain

where *aisié* appears as object of *refaisoit* and *sain* seems to represent SANUM. But B contains a passage not found in A in which *assié* (*assiet*) occurs a second time. It comes just before verses 77-83 (cf. above) and is, as we shall see, essential to the sense.

Je songai vos estiés vestis
D'une grant cote a caperon,
En vo main teniés l. peron.
S1 abatiés tout cel *assié*.

The spelling *aisié* in ms. B indicates that the word cannot be related to *asseoir* as Scheler supposed. In reality *aisié* (*assiet*, *assié*) is to be identified with the *aissié* (*aisié*) 'Bretterwand' of Tobler-Lommatzsch (I, 262b) which lists two passages in support of the meaning. The form cited from *La Violette* (v. 637) is *aisié* and the context leaves no doubt that the sense is, as the recent editor Mr. Buffum indicates, 'cloison, porte.'⁵ In the passage

³ Montaiglon and Raynaud, *Recueil général des fabliaux*, II, 197 f., reproduce Scheler's text of *La Veuve*. In their glossary, VI, 287, *assiet* is defined as 'action de se poser.'

⁴ Bbl Nat fonds franç 2168. The variants are given in Mont et Rayn. *op. cit.*, II, 197. Ms B is often quite different from A, and according to J Bédier (*Les fabliaux*, Paris, 1893, 459) is in many places superior to it.

⁵ *Le Roman de la Violette ou de Gerart de Nevers par Gerbert de Montreuil*, ed D. L. Buffum (*SATF*), 1928, p. 309. The scribe of ms A which contains *aisié* continually confuses *s* and *ss*, cf p xxx. *L'aisié* of ms A (xiv c) has as variants in the other mss *le mur* (ms B, XIII c), *l'unz* (ms C, XIV c), *l'aiz* (ms D, xv c.)

from Jehan de Tuim, cited by Tob.-Lom., *les aissiés des tours* evidently means the 'walls of the towers.'

The meaning 'wall (of boards)' fits the passages from *La Veuve* cited above, which may be explained as follows: The widow, who is addressing her dead husband, had had, before his death, a series of dreams which she now interprets in retrospect, as having been portents of his approaching end. She had seen her husband wearing a hood, with a stone (*peron*) in his hand destroying the house wall (*cel assié*) and then she saw a dove, symbol of love, come down and repair the damage: Et cest *asciet* refaisoit soing. A (Si refaisoit cel *aisié* sain. B) If the widow says (v. 83) "Mais ne sai que ce senefie," nevertheless the symbol of the dream soon becomes evident (vv. 85 f.): the ruin wrought by the husband's death is to be repaired by her remarriage.

Gautier Le Leu, author of *La Veuve*, uses this same word (*asciet*) in two other passages of his fabliaux, not listed in the Old French dictionaries, in which the sense 'wall (of boards)' is entirely acceptable. In *Del fol vilain*⁶ a box has been placed for safe keeping

256 En le huge dalés l'*asciet*.

Asciet occurs again in *Del sot chevalier* in an unedited verse of the Middleton ms., unknown to past editors of this fabliau, and to be inserted after verse 306 of the printed versions.⁷ The *sot chevalier* has just hurled a *manefle*, an iron tool, across the room. It hits a sleeping man and caroms off to strike against l'*asciet* (the wall):

Que d'autre port en l'*asciet* busce.

Mr. Buffum, in the glossary to his edition of *La Violette*, after translating *aisié* as 'cloison, porte,' adds "littéralement· petite planche." Mme Rita Lajeune adopts Mr. Buffum's 'petite planche' in her explanation of one of the passages from *La Veuve* (Si abatrés tout cel *assié*) and of the verse cited above from *Del fol vilain*.⁸ She believes that our word has the same sense as *aisson*

⁶ Cf. RR, xv, 1924, p. 37, v. 256.

⁷ Cf. Mont. et Rayn., *op. cit.*, I, 220 f. The passage in the Middleton ms. is found on folio 343 recto; cf. *Historical Manuscripts Commission. Report of the Manuscripts of Lord Middleton preserved at Wollaton Hall, Nottinghamshire, Hereford, 1911, p. 233 f*

⁸ *Moyen Age*, 1937, 6-7.

(*esson*), "la petite poutre sur laquelle on pose le pétrin afin qu'il ne touche pas directement le sol."⁹ She then identifies our word *aissié* (*assié*, *aisié*, *asciet*, the forms which she knew) with the *aisset* 'petite planche' of which Godefroy gives a single example from a late XIV century text, in which the meaning, however, is not entirely clear from the context.

All these words are derivatives of L. *axis*¹⁰ 'board, plank': *aisson* < **axonem*, *aisset* < **axittum*, but our word *aissié* (*aisié*, *assié*, *asciet*, *asciet*) is formed on *axis* with suffix *-atus* which actively combined with nouns to form adjectives during the V. L. period. The suffix *-atus* had a sense of 'possessing, containing' and frequently indicated the material of which a thing is made.¹¹ An adjective **axatus* would have meant 'made up of boards,' and applied to a wall, ultimately came to stand independently for a 'wall made up of boards.' (*ais* or *aisses*). Du Cange (cf. *assis*) notes in the *Lombard Laws* (7th-8th c.) an expression *sepes assiata* which he explains: "*sepes assiata, videtur esse illa quae ex asseribus, seu tabulis sectilibus conficitur*"—or a 'fence made of boards.' Here *assiatus* -a doubtless represents a vernacular form derived from **axatus*, which has been Latinized with *assis*, variant of *axis*, as base. Exact analogies of the evolution **axatum* > *aissié* (*aisié*, *assié*, *asciet*, *asciet*) may be seen in *plancatum*¹² > O. F. *planchié* (*planciet*, *plankiet*) 'salle planchée, fenil,' and *tabulatum* which, if it has left no traces in French, is well represented in other Romance languages: Ital. *tavolato* 'roof of boards, wall made of panels'; numerous Italian patois forms meaning 'hay-loft of boards'; Span. *tablado*, Cat. *taulat* 'scaffolding or frame-work of boards'; Port. *taboado* 'assemblage of boards,' etc.¹³ *Aissié*, *aisié*, *assié*, *asciet*,

⁹ The word is a *hapax*, cf. Tob.-Lom I, 263

¹⁰ *Axis* is a variant Latin form of *assis*. The latter has maintained itself in Italy, whereas *axis* is the basis for numerous French derivatives; cf. W. v. Wartburg, *FEW*, I, 160 b.

¹¹ Cf. Meyer-Lubke, *Grammaire*, II, p. 565; Nyrop, *Grammaire*, III, p. 101.

¹² Du Cange defines *plancatum* *tabulatum*, *asserum* *compages* (*plancher*), *domus ipsa planis instructa et constructa*, *cella superior* (*chambre haute*).

¹³ Cf. Meyer-Lubke, *REW*, 8515, Du Cange *tabulatum* *tabulatum muro-rum* (*entablement*); *tabulata*, *aedicula* *tabulis compacta*.

asciet 'wall of boards' (< **axatum*), are orthographical or dialectal variants of the same word found in different mss.¹⁴

The article *assiet* in Tob.-Lom. should then be included under *aissié* 'Bretterwand,' and the additional examples, cited in our article, should be listed there. We can localize the Old French derivatives of **axatum* in the extreme N. E : Jehan de Tuim and Gautier Le Leu (Belgian Hainaut), Gerbert de Montreuil (Montreuil-sur-mer and Ponthieu). In the modern patois, traces of **axatus* appear in Guernsey: *aissaeure* 'cloison de planches'; Nièvre *lèsi* 'fenil au-dessus de l'écurie', La Hague (Manche): *aneier* 'dressoir composé de différents ais pour mettre les assiettes.'¹⁵

CHARLES H. LIVINGSTON

Bowdoin College

THE SILK FACTORY IN CHRESTIEN DE TROYES' YVAIN

The passage of the silk-factory in the episode of the Chastel de Pesme Aventure in *Yvain* (ll. 5191-5337), which contrasts sharply with the rest of the episode and seems relatively "realistic," has usually been considered ¹ as affording a glimpse of medi-

¹⁴ *Aissié* is the normal development of **axatum*. *Aisié* appears in ms A of *La Violette* and in ms. B of *La Veuve* where the scribes continually confuse *s* and *ss*. In *assié*, *assiet*, *asciet*, etymological *ai* appears as *a*, a dialectal feature in the mss in which they occur, and in *assiet*, *asciet*, the conservation of final unsupported *t* is a common trait in the mss in which they are found, especially the Middleton ms. Note that *assiet* of ms A of *La Veuve* (verse 82) has as variant *aisié* in ms B. Our word is found twice in rhyme, in each case with the p. part. of *laisier-laxatus aissié laissié* (ms. B of *La Veuve*) and *lasciet l'asciet* (Middleton ms of *Del fol vilan*). The forms without -*t* *aissié*, *aisié*, *assié* in three manuscripts in which -*ittum* > -*et* regularly, show that the etymon cannot be **axittum* 'little board,' as supposed evidently by Mr. Buffum and Mme Lejeune.

¹⁵ Wartburg, *FEW.*, I, 160-161

¹ Cf. W. Forster, in the introduction to his edition of *Oligès* (Halle, 1884), p. xiv; R. Zenker, *Yvainstudien* (Halle, 1921; *ZRP.* Beiheft 50), pp. 301-305; G. Cohen, *Chrestien de Troyes et son œuvre* (Paris, 1932), pp. 340-342. For a discussion of the monetary wages mentioned and a resolution of the problem involved, cf. Forster's note to ll. 5311, 5312 in his edition of *Yvain* (Halle, 1887).

aeval industrial conditions in Northern France, of a workshop in which three hundred women are engaged in manufacturing silk and silken goods, under intolerable living conditions and at miserable wages,² and victimized by a cheating superior. This passage, together with one from *Perceval*, has even been cited as evidence for the existence in twelfth-century France of a rising silk-industry, with huge sweat-shops, in a manner anticipatory of modern developments.³

So far as the description of living conditions and current wages is concerned, this is doubtless true; that mediaeval workers, especially women, were the victims of great exploitation by the then nascent capitalism is well known;⁴ in 1279, conditions had become so bad that there was a revolt of textile workers in Paris. Certain other factors, however, lead us to suggest that we must recognize still another element in Chrestien's silk-factory episode: the derivation of the silk-factory theme from Sicilian or Oriental sources.

In the first place, the picture which Chrestien paints, of a great workshop employing three hundred women at once, had no parallel in the French industrial system of his time. The central workshop system was known in antiquity, but had disappeared from the West during the Middle Ages.⁵ During this period, the method of employment which prevailed in the textile industry was that of farming out hand-work to the employés, who then performed the necessary operations at home.⁶ It was by means of this system, and by forbidding the individual workers to contract directly with consumers, that the mercers established a stringent monopoly upon the distribution of work and forced the textile workers into complete economic dependence. Even the man who is usually credited with having been the first to develop the central workshop system

² The introduction of the element of monetary wages is of course wholly out of keeping with the women's status as prisoner-slaves in a half magical castle, and suggests derivation from contemporary conditions

³ F. Michel, *Recherches sur le commerce, la fabrication et l'usage des étoffes de soie* (Paris, 1852), p. 91 f.

⁴ Cf. E. Levasseur, *Histoire des classes ouvrières et de l'industrie en France avant 1789* (Paris, 1900), I, 314, 315, 320, 459.

⁵ N. B. Gras, *Industrial Evolution* (Cambridge, 1930), pp. 78, 79.

⁶ Gras, *op cit*, p. 39, Levasseur, *op cit*, I, 459; G. Fagniez, *Études sur l'industrie et les classes industrielles à Paris au XIII^e et au XIV^e siècle* (Paris, 1877), p. 80.

to some extent in Western Europe, Jehan Bomebroke of Douai (fl. ca. 1270-1300, a century after Chrestien's time) used his workshop more as a central distributing point than for the actual performance of the work.⁷ Moreover, the scale upon which Chrestien describes the factory in *Yvain* as being established would be large even for the present time, and far beyond anything that could have existed in the twelfth century. Even in 1300, the number of persons employed in the silk-industry is put at 39 women and 4 men.⁸ Prison life (which is of course suggested as a possibility by the general background of Chrestien's episode) is excluded as a possible source by the fact that, up to the end of the eighteenth century, prison life in France (except in the *galères*) was one of enforced idleness, not forced labor.⁹

Furthermore, the manufacture of silk as a large-scale or even medium-sized industry was quite unknown in France at Chrestien's time. Silk and silken goods were a great rarity in the West during the Middle Ages, and were among the type of goods imported from the East as a luxury;¹⁰ the only type of work done in France on silk was that of re-working the material in worn-out goods, to re-use the precious thread,¹¹ and this occupation could employ only relatively few workers (cf. the figures given above for 1300). The first introduction into France of large-scale manufacture of silk took place at Lyons in 1466,¹² soon followed by similar establishments at Tours in 1470 and at Vitré in 1476. The silk-industry had previously spread throughout Italy from Lucca (as a consequence of the scattering of the Lucchese weavers by Castruccio Castracane's defeat of the Guelphs in 1314¹³), whither it had been brought from Sicily around the middle of the thirteenth century.

At Chrestien's time, the only places where silk-manufacture was

⁷ Gras, *op cit.*, p. 40.

⁸ Fagniez, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

⁹ U. S. Department of Labor. *Convict labor* (Washington, 1886), II, 418

¹⁰ Levasseur, *op cit*, I, 415, Michel, *op cit.*, 94; A. Doren, *Italienische Wirtschaftsgeschichte* (Jena, 1934), pp. 133, 371.

¹¹ Levasseur, *op cit.*, I, 415.

¹² Michel, *op. cit.*, II, 270.

¹³ Michel, *op cit*, 87; Doren, *op cit.*, p. 495; R. Davidsohn, *Geschichte von Florenz* (Berlin, 1896-1927), IV, 2, pp 74, 75.

carried on were Sicily and the Mussulman Orient. We find that in Sicily, the industry was carried on in a part of the king's palace, in a workshop under royal auspices; in 1221, Frederick II handed over to the Jews the monopoly of this industry, which had previously been a royal prerogative.¹⁴ This institution is considered by most historians to be a continuation of the same type of undertaking established by the Mussulman predecessors of the Norman kings in Sicily,¹⁵ there is evidence for the manufacture of silk cloth in Sicily as early as the end of the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century.¹⁶ Of especial interest is the fact that in the palace workshops in the Moslem world, the superintendent was a figure of considerable importance in the king's retinue (cf. the surly and domineering *portier* in *Yvain*),¹⁷ and particularly the fact that in these workshops, there were Frankish Christian girls kept as captives and forced to work as slaves manufacturing silk.¹⁸

In the Moslem and Sicilian courts, therefore, we find a type of establishment devoted to the manufacture of silk which is considerably closer to the silk-factory in *Yvain* than anything that could have existed in the France of Chrestien's times: a central workshop, operated as an adjunct to a palace, in which the seamstresses were treated as slaves, and in which certain of the women were actually captives from Christian lands, and tyrannized over by an official of the palace.

Although direct evidence for Chrestien's having utilized this source is of course not at hand, there are at least three channels through which he might easily have heard of the Sicilian and Moslem silk-factories and introduced a similar establishment into his imaginary castle: from Crusaders returning home from Eastern lands, from stories of Sicily and its conquest by the Normans, a relatively recent happening; or from traders coming to the fairs of

¹⁴ Doren, *op cit*, p 448.

¹⁵ Michel, *op cit*, pp 73, 74, F Chalandon, *Histoire de la domination normande en Italie et en Sicile* (Paris, 1907), II, 703 The Sicilian word *cavari* "silk-weaver" is a loan-word from Arabic *hariri* "silk-weaver", Amari, *Storia dei musulmani di Sicilia* (Firenze, 1854-1872), III, 2, pp. 800 ff.

¹⁶ Amari, *op cit*, II, 448 ff.

¹⁷ In the Arabic writer Ebn-Kaldoun, referred by Amari, *Journal Asiatique*, series IV, vol VII, 215.

¹⁸ Michel, *op cit*, p 76, fn. 3, with references to the Arabic writer Ibn-Djobair.

Champagne or to other parts of France, and bringing tales of the origin of the silk goods along with their wares.

In view of the correspondence pointed out above, therefore, it seems advisable to analyze the episode of the silk-factory in *Yvain* into four main elements: the general background¹⁹ (the castle—possibly a reflection of the Celtic legend of the kingdom of the dead, from which no man may come forth alive²⁰—the women prisoners, and their oppressor who is killed by Yvain), the Minotaur-like element of the tribute of thirty maidens yearly by the king of the Ile as Puceles,²¹ and the half-human monsters with whom all comers must fight, the main structure of the silk-manufacturing establishment itself, of Sicilian-Moslem origin;²² and the details of the miserable living conditions, low wages, and oppression of the workers, borrowed from contemporary conditions in the textile industry.

ROBERT A. HALL, JR.

Brown University

THE CONCLUSION OF VOLTAIRE'S *POÈME SUR LE DÉSASTRE DE LISBONNE*

Five years ago, in his biography of Voltaire,¹ Mr. Alfred Noyes took Lord Morley vigorously to task for his pessimistic interpreta-

¹⁹ Cf. J. D. Bruce, *Evolution of Arthurian Romance* (Gottingen and Baltimore, 1923), II, 80

²⁰ Cf. Zenker, *op. cit.*, p. 301 ff.; G. Paris, *Romania*, XII (1883), 510 ff.

²¹ Cf. Zenker, *loc. cit.*

²² A valuable confirmatory parallel has been pointed out to me by Prof. L. Spitzer: the mention in an Old Spanish ballad (S. Griswold Morley, *Spanish Ballads*, no. 39) of three hundred ladies in Doña Alda's retinue, of whom one hundred are spinning gold thread and another hundred are weaving delicate cloth (*cendal*). Although the ballad itself purports to describe a French court of Carolingian times, its Spanish prototype and activities carried on therein would of course have been open to influence from the Mussulman world.

¹ Alfred Noyes, *Voltaire*, N. Y., Sheed and Ward, 1936. These pages of the first (1936) edition (pp. 464-70) appear unchanged in the third, London, Faber and Faber, 1939 (pp. 462-68). This later edition, says Mr. Noyes, had in turn been reprinted "unaltered from that of the second edition which the former publishers withdrew from circulation, by order of the Supreme Congregation of the Holy See, in June, 1938" (*Ibid.*, p. xi)

tion² of the famous *Poème sur le Désastre de Lisbonne* (1756) and, as evidence, quoted the concluding lines of the poem, which ends by giving emphasis to the more optimistic note of "l'espérance."³ Says Mr. Noyes "Hope, not fear, is here the last word."⁴ After several further pages of discussion tending to show the relative orthodoxy of Voltaire's poem, Mr. Noyes concludes. "It is one of the sincerest pieces of work that Voltaire ever wrote."⁵

Voltaire was undoubtedly deeply moved by the tragedy of human suffering caused by the Lisbon earthquake. He expressed this feeling in lines that are generally vigorous, expressive, and themselves deeply moving. But Voltaire's fundamental sincerity in presenting the problem of Evil and human misery in the world does not extend to the all-important conclusion of which Mr. Noyes makes so much. This fact is clearly shown by Voltaire's own correspondence quoted by the present writer in an article in this review over ten years ago.⁶ There is no question but that Voltaire was attacking, as openly as he dared, the doctrine of Providence.⁷ Rousseau had no doubt about this, as is evident from his long letter of refutation addressed to the author under date of August 18, 1756, and itself known as "Lettre sur la Providence"⁸ Through the winter of 1756, Voltaire was seeking counsel of his friends about his poem, heeding their criticisms up to a certain point, adding a whole new conclusion with emphasis upon *hope*, endeavor-

² John Morley, *Voltaire* (1872), London, Macmillan, 1913, pp. 283-85. The text in its present form dates from 1885. Mr. Noyes, in quoting Lord Morley, has omitted, without indication, a significant passage essential to an understanding of his real thought.

³ Voltaire, *Œuvres complètes*, Moland ed., ix, 478.

⁴ Noyes, *op cit* (ed. of 1936), p. 466.

⁵ *Ibid*, p. 470.

⁶ George R. Havens, "Voltaire's Pessimistic Revision of the Conclusion of his *Poème sur le Désastre de Lisbonne*," *MLN.*, XLIV (1929), 489-92.

⁷ As early as December 7, 1755, Du Pan wrote to Mme Freudenreich about Voltaire's poem on Lisbon. "Les dévots diront qu'il blâme la Providence, je ne sais s'il publiera cette pièce." (MSS. Du Pan, v, ff. 38 and verso. Bibliothèque publique et universitaire de Genève.) Later Du Pan wrote categorically, if crudely, to Freudenreich. "Je n'ai pas vu ses vers sur Lisbonne, mais je sais qu'après la ruine de cette ville, le Prof. Vernet étant allé à St. Jean [Les Délices], Voltaire lui dit, eh bien, Mr. le Professeur, de cette affaire la Providence en a dans le cul; voilà son texte." (*Ibid*, March 7-8, 1756.)

⁸ J.-J. Rousseau, *Correspondance générale*, Paris, Colin, II (1924), 303-24.

ing in short to suggest the essentials of his thought, while avoiding serious trouble and appeasing, if possible, what he called "les cerbères"⁹ of theology. At the end, he was afraid even that he might have gone too far in the direction of conservatism. "Je n'ai peur que d'être trop orthodoxe, parce que cela ne me sied pas."¹⁰

Several newly-revealed letters of Voltaire to his publisher, Gabriel Cramer of Geneva, throw further light on this important question of Voltaire's real attitude in this poem. "Les copies qui ont couru," writes Voltaire, "ont révolté malgré le beau mot d'*espérer* que vous avez sagement mis à la fin."¹¹

In other words, Voltaire, somewhat alarmed by criticisms of earlier versions, had already softened the conclusion of his poem by adding the word "*espérer*,"¹² apparently at the instance of Cramer himself. This letter dates probably from February 14, 1756.¹³ On February 28, Voltaire wrote to Pastor Bertrand, mentioning this addition of a new note of mild optimism.¹⁴ But his Protestant friend was evidently still not satisfied. On March 7, therefore, Voltaire wrote him: "Vous verrez que j'aurai profité de vos sages et judicieuses réflexions"¹⁵ This is the moment when a new conclusion, twenty-four lines longer, was at length added, with still more emphasis upon the idea of *hope*.¹⁶

Voltaire had evidently yielded to persistent clamor. His secretary Colini says:

Lorsque ce poeme n'était encore qu'une ébauche, il eut la bêtise de le lire à quelques Suisses. Ces Suisses, s'imaginant que le poète combattait

⁹ Moland, xxxix, 5

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 13

¹¹ George R. Havens, "Twelve New Letters of Voltaire to Gabriel Cramer," *RR*, xxxi (1940), 343

¹² With this addition, the poem then concluded

Mortels, il faut souffrir,

Se soumettre, adorer, *espérer* et mourir. (ll. 207-08)

Cf. Georges Ascoli, *Voltaire. Poèmes philosophiques*, Mimeographed Copy, Centre de documentation universitaire, Fasc. v, 204-05.

¹³ For evidence as to the dating of this letter, see my article in *RR*, xxxi, 343, n. 11

¹⁴ Moland, xxxviii, 556

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, xxxix, 2

¹⁶ For a discussion of this new text, cf. Ascoli, *op. cit.*, pp. 206-07. This twenty-four-line addition was preceded by four other new lines (ll. 207-10), bringing the poem to a conclusion at line 234.

l'axiome de Pope, crurent qu'il n'admettait que la proposition contraire, savoir que dans ce monde *tout est mal*. Cette bérue de quelques Suisses n'a pas laissé de lui faire quelque petite tracasserie.¹⁷

Colini writes with a certain prudence similar to the position adopted by Voltaire in his explanatory Preface to the poem. The famous Dr. Tronchin, however, writing to Rousseau on September 1, 1756, speaks out sharply, giving an idea of the bitterness of some of this criticism on the part of the Swiss friends of Voltaire.

Lorsqu'il eut fait son Poeme, je le conjurai de le brûler, nos amis communs se réunirent pour obtenir la même grâce, tout ce qu'on put gagner sur lui fut de l'adoucir, vous verrez la différence en comparant le second Poeme au premier.¹⁸

Thus it is clear under what limitations Voltaire expressed his real thought in this poem. He did not find it expedient to give his attitude with complete frankness. Under the circumstances, this is understandable enough. He did, however, as Tronchin said, finally consent to *tone down* the disconcerting pessimism of his conclusion by adding the rather noncommittal emphasis upon the idea of *hope*. He refused to alter his text in more fundamental fashion or to follow the insistence of some of his *entourage* at Geneva that he withhold the poem entirely from publication.

Lord Morley, with his broad understanding of Voltaire and of the eighteenth century, was right in his interpretation of this poem as essentially pessimistic. Rousseau confirms his judgment. Nor was the latter deceived by the changes in the conclusion, whether or not he knew at the time that they were changes. "Au lieu des consolations que j'espérois," he wrote to Voltaire, "vous ne faites que m'affliger."¹⁹ Undoubtedly too, this impression of pessimism was exactly what Voltaire wished to convey. "Le fond de l'ouvrage," he insisted to Bertrand, "reste malheureusement d'une vérité incontestable."²⁰ Voltaire, in short, desired to appease and placate to the bare minimum that was necessary, but without fundamentally doing injustice to his thought. "Il a fallu dire ce que je pense," he wrote, "et le dire d'une manière qui ne révoltât ni les esprits trop philosophes ni les esprits trop crédules."²¹

¹⁷ Moland, xxxix, 10.

¹⁸ Rousseau, *Corr. générale*, II, 327.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 304.

²⁰ Moland, xxxviii, 556.

²¹ *Ibid.*, xxxix, 21.

Mr. Noyes was misled by taking at its face value the final text of the poem, without going behind it to the clear evidence of the correspondence and other contemporary documents. He endeavors to give us a too-orthodox Voltaire. The *Poème sur le Désastre de Lisbonne* is in fact basically pessimistic. The conclusion was added *après coup* to appease the watchdogs of theology. It was not the spontaneous outpouring of Voltaire's thought. We must therefore be careful not to take it seriously today.

GEORGE R. HAVENS

Ohio State University

BINÔME

M. Dauzat (*Le français moderne* VIII, 111-2) montre que les explications des termes de mathématique *monôme*, *binôme*, *trinôme* etc. par *νόμος* 'loi' et *νομός* 'partage, division' sont erronées, et, tout en s'étonnant "que les linguistes n'aient pas songé plus tôt à interroger le latin médiéval," signale, d'après des historiens des mathématiques comme Tannery et Enestrom, la présence du terme *binomium* au sens moderne 'expression algébrique à deux termes' dans Gérard de Crémone (1114-1187) comme traduction du terme d'Euclide ἐκ δύο ὀνομάτων: "Le mot n'a donc pas été créé avec *nomos*, mais avec *onoma*, nom, terme" et *binôme* (attesté pour la première fois en fr. en 1554 dans l'*Algèbre* de J. Peletier) n'est qu'une "francisation du latin *binomium*."

Je ferai remarquer que le *Oxford Dictionary* s.vv. *binomy* et *binomial* (attesté depuis 1557, cf. *binomium* latinisant attesté dans des textes anglais de 1570/1) a déjà relevé l'existence d'un néolatin "*binomius—um*, in algebraical use in 16th c., but common in late Latin in the general sense of having two personal names; see Ducange. For this, the classical L. word was *binominis*, *binomius* may be compared with *homicida*" Le même dictionnaire mentionne à côté de *monomial* et *monome* (attestés plus tard que *binomial*, *binomy* en anglais: 1706, 1719, et, par conséquent formés d'après ces termes) la forme *mononomial* "intended as more correct form of *monomial*" à partir de De Quincey 1844 et remontant à une expression française (d'après le passage de 1873 cité: "slavishly copied from the French")—évidemment, c'est à l'influence de la pseudo-étymologie *νόμος* (que mentionne p. ex. Littré) que cette

forme récente est due. L'*Enciclopedia italiana* s. v. *binomio* recourt déjà à Euclide, qui distinguait six espèces de binômes du type $\epsilon\kappa\ \delta\upsilon\omicron\ \delta\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$ et autant d'espèces de $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\tau\omicron\mu\acute{\eta}$, c'est à dire des types $3 + \sqrt{5}$ et $3 - \sqrt{2}$: "Questa nomenclatura complicata è stata a poco a poco abbandonata. Mentre ancora in Ghaligai (*Arithm*, 1552...) 'binomio è una linea che per meno di due nomi non si può dire,'¹ e parimenti in Bombelli (1572. . .) 'il binomio è una quantità composta di due nomi aggiunti insieme dissimili,' il Descartes (1637, *Geom* . . .) parla già di un *binome composé de la quantité inconnue + ou — quelque autre quantité*. Dal Newton in poi (1676), i matematici hanno chiamato *binomio* la somma di due quantità qualsiasi, positive o negative." Il ressort du passage que *binomio* est compris par les mathématiciens italiens du XVII^e s. comme "di due nomi" et correspond aussi au point de vue du sens (seulement 'la somme de membres positifs') au terme euclidien.

Il est évident que l'étymologie $\delta\nu\omicron\mu\alpha$ que propose M. Dauzat doit être abandonnée. L'expression euclidienne $\epsilon\nu\ \delta\upsilon\omicron\ \delta\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$ n'est que, si je puis me servir d'un terme que j'ai jadis forgé moi-même, l' "étymologie spirituelle" de *binomium*, l' "étymologie matérielle" de ce calque d'après le grec est évidemment le composé néolatine *bi-nom-um* (de *bis* + fr. *nom*). un hybridisme **bi-(o)nom-um* est impossible même les faibles humanistes du moyen âge auraient su que $\delta\acute{\omega}\nu\nu\mu\omicron\varsigma$, $\mu\omicron\nu\acute{\omega}\nu\nu\mu\omicron\varsigma$ étaient les formations grecques correctes. On pourrait naturellement se demander pourquoi la restitution du terme roman en latin correct n'a pas eu lieu (*binominis*), mais presque chaque page de Du Cange nous enseigne combien ces latinisations faciles étaient usuelles (cf. *nominare* = *nominare*, *denombramentum* = *denominatio* etc.) .

Maintenant, comment ce *binomius*, préexistant à *binomium* terme mathématique, au sens de 'portant deux noms,' auquel le Oxford Dict. renvoie, et qui apparaît aussi dans le dictionnaire de Georges (mais pas dans le Th L L) comme glose de $\delta\acute{\omega}\nu\nu\mu\omicron\varsigma$, a-t-il été formé? Des textes cités par Du Cange nous éclairent là-dessus: *fertur enim quia post baptismum binomius esset*, écrit "Herigerius Lobensis [=Lobbes, Flandre] de Vita S. Ursmani abbatis" (+1107). De même Lambertus Ardensis ("vixit sub Philippo

¹ L'étymologie est indiquée encore plus clairement par ce mathématicien dans le passage cité par Tomm.-Bell. s. v. *binomio* "Ora è necessario multiplicare i binomi, e nota questo nome binomio nasce da Euclide nel Decimo."

Augusto," Du Cange) · *Robertus videlicet, qui ut tunc temporis erat consuetudo et adhuc plerumque tenetur, binomius erat, sed suppressa vocationis proprietate, inolescente usus assuetudine dictus est Manasses, postea Ghisnensis comes*, passage que Duchêne a expliqué ainsi. ce personnage a été appelé par ses parents Manasses dès la naissance, mais au baptême Robert, d'après le comte de Flandre. Suivent dans Du Cange de nombreux témoignages de cet usage d'indiquer la régénération spirituelle, effectuée par le baptême, par un nouveau nom (on pourrait dire que le nom *René* = *renatus* est le type de ces noms indiquant la régénération baptismale). Il est donc évident que *binomius* est une formation, non pas latine sur *nomen* (qui est *binominis*, employé par les Romains en parlant de noms comme Numa Pompilius), mais semi-romane sur le mot français *nom* (ou, à la rigueur, sur l'ital. *nome*—mais les exemples de Du Cange sont français, flamands, allemands).² Ce *binomius* hybride (franco-latin) a été ensuite transposé par les mathématiciens humanistes en français (*binôme*), italien (*binomio*), anglais (*binomium*, *binomial*, *binomy*). Ce qui importe dans cette étude lexicographique, c'est le transfert d'un mot exprimant un trait de la vie religieuse (les deux noms du chrétien avant et après le baptême) à la science c'est un fait courant dans la civilisation médiévale que cette prévalence et priorité du terme religieux—toute science au moyen âge empruntant de préférence son vocabulaire au langage ecclésiastique.³ La formation hybride de *monomium* (qui offre une haplogogie *mono-[no]m-um* comme *tragi[co]-comédie*) d'après *binomium* emploie le grec *μόνος* 'seul' d'après des cas comme *monoculus* 'qui n'a qu'un œil' (au lieu de *unoculus* de Plaute), traduction des gloses (C Gl L III, 252) de *μονόφθαλμος* (qui a été d'abord transporté tel quel en latin *monoptalmus*, C Gl L, et qui est l'ancêtre du *monocle* moderne, cf. Bloch). peut-être *μόνος* faisait plus savant que *uni-* (cf. les avatars de *unicornis* traduction de *μονόκερως* en roman: fr. *licorne* etc.), et insistait davantage sur

² Ce mot se trouve encore dans des vocabulaires allemands de 1487 et 1521 (sous les formes *binomis*, *-ius*, *-us* 'zweynamig' dont deux indiquent l'interférence du classique *binominis*) qu'enregistre Diefenbach, et dans des textes latins de Hongrie *binomius* a 1778-9, *binomen* a 1540-50, que cite Bartal

³ Aujourd'hui le contraire arrive le mot *sacral* était un mot forgé par les médecins et employé par les folkloristes avant qu'un Maritain ne l'adaptât à ses besoins théologiques, v. *Le français moderne* vi, 127.

l'idée de l'individualité inhérente à l'unité, puisque *μόνος* signifie aussi '(seul et) excellent', cf. aussi *monogame*—*bigame*, * *monospes* 'unius pedis' attesté par Bartal, s'opposant à *bipedaneus*; *monorime*; *monoplane*—*biplane*, formations encouragées par *monocle*—*binocle*.

En italien, *binomio* a gardé plus longtemps son sens extra-mathématique. Tommaseo-Bellini en attestent l'usage au sens de 'portant deux noms' dans un poème comique *la Bucchereide* de Bellini (1729) et la nomenclature des plantes selon Linné (type: *cytissus laburnum*) s'appelle encore aujourd'hui *nomenclatura binomia* (*Encicl. Ital*). Le ò (= o ouvert) ne s'explique pas par *nome* 'nom' et indique soit un latinisme, soit un mot d'emprunt, fait qui concorde avec ce que j'ai dit plus haut (cf. ital. *nòmina* avec o ouvert et la remarque de REW s. v. *nomen*) Gérard de Crémone, qui lisait Euclide dans des traductions arabes (v. *Encicl Ital*), a donc utilisé un terme devenu courant en latin médiéval, probablement d'origine française. G. Sarton ("Introduction to the History of Science" II, 338) nous apprend qu'il ne faut pas trop se fier à l'attribution à Gérard de toutes les traductions portant son nom. il était probablement le directeur d'une école de traducteurs—de sorte que l'apparition de *binomus* dans cette traduction n'implique pas nécessairement une origine italienne.

LEO SPITZER

AUZELS CASSADORS, V. 2334

Under the article *tertz* (<*tertius*) of his *Supplementwörterbuch*, Levy cites the following lines from Daude de Pradas' curious treatise on falconry:

Prendetz las fueillas del laurier
ez en bon vi las boilletz tan
que l vis *torna ters* per garan¹ (vv. 2332-4)
(Take the leaves of the laurel and boil them in good wine
to the point where the wine turns altogether clear)

⁴ Nous trouvons déjà en grec anc. *μόνος* = *εἰς* 'un' (ou aussi en combinaison avec *εἰς*) et il semble que dans des milieux néolatin on comptât *monos*, *duo* etc. (cf. Bartal s. v. *monos*, 'unus').

¹ Concerning Levy's query as to whether one should correct *torna* to *torne*, see below. Nothing in the variants, at any rate, would justify such

His usual keenness, however, leads him to wonder whether the passage, incomprehensible to him, belongs under the heading where he placed it. His skepticism was apparently justified, as will be seen.

The form *ters* may be the past participle of *terzer*, which the *Petit Dictionnaire* renders 'essuyer, nettoyer.' The corresponding OF *terdre* is given as 'purifier,' but applies to cleansing from sin (Godefroy). *Ters* also occurs in Catalan as 'pulit, llustrós, brunyit'² with the remark "Dit del estil llimat y pur," showing a figurative meaning as possible. OF *ters* is found as 'dénué' (Godefroy). Modern Provençal *tersa*, 'nettoyer, frotter, essuyer' though not listed by Mistral, may be included here.³

A glance at the context of our passage may serve to clarify the meanings of *ters* offered by the dictionaries. The purpose of Daude's procedure is to cure a falcon of an ailment which he calls a "peire en cap" ('stone in—or on—the head'). Laurel leaves are boiled in wine, the decoction being administered to a chicken. Since certain species of laurel contain cyanide, enough to be fatal to sheep, the result is not surprising. The flesh of the fowl is fed to the falcon, according to a practice not uncommon at that time.⁴

Franchières⁵ reports a method of treatment identical with that of Daude, for the sixteenth century, with the minor substitution of a "jeune pigeon" for the chicken. He would have the wine served cold, evidently to allow precipitation. He would agree with Daude in requiring sufficient boiling, perhaps to insure as complete a solution as possible of the active ingredients. Now the modern technician speaks of a liquid made clear as having been "fined." "Fine" may also be used as a synonym of "bright, polished," although, it is true, in figurative senses. The range of meanings is thus coincident with the meanings of *ters*, i. e. *tergere* signifies 'to wipe,' presumably, also, 'to polish'; *tersus* applies to a literary style.

We believe that Eng. *terse* in the following citation is the same a change. The MS of the Arsenal reads *torn al ters*, that of Vich *torn al tets*, with the second *t* of the last word difficult to make out. The two MSS, incidentally, are fairly closely related.

² Labernia, *Diccionari de la llengua catalana*, Barcelona, 1840

³ Cf Boucoiran, *Dict. des idiomes méridionaux*, Paris-Leipzig, 1898.

⁴ Physiologists tell me there is no value in the practice, whether theoretically or practically considered.

⁵ *La fauconnerie*, Portiers, 1567.

as the word in our passage: "I stay 'till by the strength of *terse* claret you have wet yourself into courage (Shadwell)," despite the *NED* notation: "Perhaps not the same word. Some suggest *Thiers*, name of a wine-producing place in Puy-de-Dôme." It will be noted that both Daude's term and the English counterpart refer to wine.

The reading of v. 2334 is not well established, as we have indicated. One may perhaps read *torn'a ters*, but such a construction with a past participle is unlikely. The situation may permit of an indicative, because questions of unattained result are often subject to varied and quite personal interpretations.

A. H. SCHUTZ

Ohio State University

THE DATE OF THILLOIS'S *SOLYMAN II*

In 1617, Georges Thillois, "bachelier en théologie et rhétoricien" of the college of Rheims, published a tragedy in five actes, *Solyman II, quatorziesme Empereur des Turcs*.¹ A certain Louis Paris, who was at one time a librarian at Rheims, says that the play, which he calls the *Mort de Mustapha*, was acted at the Collège des Bons Enfants in 1608.² As his authority he gives J. B. F. Gérusez: *Description de la ville de Reims*,³ where the only information concerning Thillois is to be found in the following passage:

M Loriguet, teinturier à Reims, m'ayant communiqué deux pièces qui ont été jouées au commencement du XVII^e siècle, je crois faire plaisir aux lecteurs en leur présentant ici l'analyse. En 1624, le 9 mai, les écoliers de l'Université jouèrent dans l'église de Saint Antoine *L'Élection de Saint Nicolas* [of a student, Soret An analysis is given] . Seize ans plutôt, un écolier de rhétorique nommé Thillois, avait composé une meilleure pièce divisée en cinq actes . . .

An analysis of the plot follows, but Gérusez does not at any time say that the play was given at the Collège des Bons Enfants.⁴

¹ Reims, Simon de Foigny, 1617.

² Louis Paris *Le Théâtre à Reims*, Reims Michaud, 1885, p. 84.

³ Reims, 1817, II, 411-2.

⁴ This may have been inferred from the information on the title page that the play was one of a series for the "amphithéâtre du grand collège de Reims."

Since Gérusez does not give his source for the statement that the play was composed sixteen years before 1624 or in 1608, it is quite possible that he was mistaken. The only printed edition of the play I have been able to find bears the date of 1617, which could be approximately *six* years before May, 1624. This is made probable by a bit of evidence connected with the source. The author says that his source is Chalcondyle Athenien as translated by Blaise de Vigenère, in Livre 4, chapitre 17. This translation⁵ appeared in 1578 and in 1584, but Vigenère having died in 1596,⁶ a third edition was completed by Thomas, sieur d'Embry and published in 1612.⁷ The material on which the play is based does not appear in the first two editions but in the continuation "jusques à présent" (1612) by the sieur d'Embry, book IV, chapter 47 (rather than 17 as Thillois says). Since there appears to be no earlier edition containing this continuation, it seems probable that the play could not have been composed before 1612.

LANCASTER E DABNEY

The University of Texas

THE LONDON MERCHANT AND LE MIERRE'S
BARNEVELT

In a recent survey of the main currents of Anglo-French literary relations during the eighteenth century, F. C. Green cites as a French adaptation of Lillo's *George Barnwell, or The London Merchant* a tragedy which he describes as "a poetic chastened revision [of the English play] by Le Mierre."¹ He apparently refers to the

⁵ *L'Histoire de la Décadence de l'Empire Grec, et établissement de celui des Turcs; comprise en dix livres, par Nicolas Chalcondyle Athenien. De la traduction de Blaise de Vigenere*, Paris, Nicholas Chesneau, 1578 and Paris, Abel l'Angelier, 1584.

⁶ A manuscript note in a copy of *La Croix du Maine* by Louvain Geliot, a lawyer of Dijon, is reported by La Monnoye. It stated that Vigenère died in 1596.

⁷ Paris, Veufve l'Angelier, 1612.

¹ Green, F. C. *Minuet A Critical Survey of French and English Literary Ideas in the Eighteenth Century*. N. Y., E. P. Dutton & Co., 1935. p. 142.

patriotic tragedy *Barneveldt* by Antoine-Marin Le Mierre, presented for the first time at the *Théâtre de la Nation* on June 30, 1790.² Unfortunately for Dr. Green's theory of relationship, this work bears no similarity to the English play apart from the accidental similarity between the names *Barnwell* and *Barneveldt*. This confusion is not inexcusable, since the English name was rendered into French variously as *Barnewell*, *Barnewelt*, *Barneveldt* and *Barneveldt* by French authors and critics of that period, but, aside from this accidental similarity, the plays are in no way related. Lillo's, as is well known, deals with the downfall of a young clerk who has fallen into the hands of the experienced and unscrupulous hussy, (Mrs.) Milwood, while Le Mierre's *Barneveldt* dramatizes an historic situation taken from the life of the Dutch patriot John of Barneveld.³

W. D. PENDELL

Baldwin-Wallace College

MARMONTEL AS A SOURCE OF STENDHAL

Stendhal had certainly read Marmontel's *Mémoires d'un père pour servir à l'instruction de ses enfans*.

He mentions them three times in his *Racine et Shakespeare*, fourteen times in the *Correspondance*, and several times in the *De l'Amour*. He states that he had read them twice before 1806. Stendhal was an indefatigable reader of memoirs as his letters show; he makes clear that he is seeking in them true facts from real life for his great realistic works. It can be shown that he found many such in Marmontel. He writes: "Le vrai tableau de la société des gens de lettres de 1778 se trouve dans les Mémoires de Marmontel. . ."¹

Of course the well-known source of *Le Rouge et le Noir* is *l'Affaire Berthet*. Indeed M. Pierre Jourda, the eminent *stendhalien*, says in the introduction to his edition of *Le Rouge*: "On

² Published by Duschesne & Fils, 1791

³ Cf. John Lothrop Motley's *Life and Death of John of Barneveld, advocate of Holland; with a view of the primary causes and movements of the Thirty Years' War*, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1874

¹ *Correspondance*, II, 274.

voyait jusqu'ici, dans l'affaire Berthet, l'unique source à laquelle Stendhal avait puisé."² It is unquestionably true that the idea and broad lines of the story of Julien Sorel come from *l'affaire Berthet*, but it will be evident that Marmontel furnished many important details in the character and adventures of Sorel. Stendhal's use of Marmontel is most apparent in the first one hundred pages of the first volume of the *Mémoires*.

The characters of the two young men, Marmontel and Sorel, are very similar. Both are inspired by great ambition. Both study diligently and earn the envy of their classmates. Each works with the same object—to escape from his lowly birth. Each of them reads of the exploits of great men, thus pouring oil on the fires of ambition. In each story the father opposes the son's desire for education. Each of the two heroes intends to enter the priesthood and seek glory and honor in the church. Each abandons the idea when a better avenue to his goal offers itself. The young Marmontel goes to the college of Clermont and in order better to astonish the professors states falsely that he has had instruction from only a poor country priest. He is given a theme to develop and naturally distinguishes himself. This is certainly the hypocrisy of Sorel, and used to the same end. "Je me hâtai de me produire, et ne négligeai rien pour être remarqué."³ These words of Marmontel sound almost as if they came from the lips of Sorel. Marmontel can enter the order of the *Sulpiciens* without examination, but he declines: "J'avais besoin d'être recommandé, et pour cela d'être aperçu, nommé, distingué dans la foule."⁴ What could be more *sorelien*?

The similarity in the adventures of the two young men is still closer and begins at birth. Each of them is the son of a poor man in a small village. Both study under a parish priest. At college Marmontel's zeal earns him the dislike of his comrades. Sorel has the same experience in the seminary. During the vacations Marmontel studies with a country priest. They converse in Latin, as do Sorel and the *abbé Chelan*. Marmontel becomes *répétiteur d'études* at the college. Sorel, of course, was *répétiteur* at the seminary of Besançon. Marmontel wears the ecclesiastical habit without being a priest, as Sorel does. Marmontel enters the service of the

² Stendhal, *Le Rouge et le Noir*, Paris, Fernand Roches, 1929, p. xix.

³ Marmontel, J-F, *Les Mémoires*, Paris, 1806, I, 76.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 94.

Marquis de Linars as tutor to his son, Sorel is employed by the Marquis de la Mole. Finally entering the order of the *Sulpiciens*, Marmontel is received by his bishop, who interests himself, in a very flattering manner, in the future of the young priest. This episode probably inspired the interview of Sorel with the bishop of Besançon, who takes a marked interest in the young man and gives him a gift as token of his favor. The aspiring Marmontel exhibits his erudition on every occasion by reciting long extracts from the Bible and Virgil. Julien Sorel was accustomed to do the same. Let us note, too, that it is possible that Stendhal found in these *Mémoires* the name for his little village of Verrières. Marmontel makes reference to the forest of Verrières⁵ and in addition mentions often a certain Mlle Verrières. I believe this will definitely establish the fact that Marmontel contributed much that went into the making of the immortal Julien Sorel.

LESTER J. PRONGER

Vancouver

THE CLICHÉ BASIS FOR SOME OF THE METAPHORS OF JEAN GIRAUDOUX

The works of Jean Giraudoux offer a display of metaphorical fireworks which at first bewilders. The reader may soon grow weary and may lay down his book, protesting that Giraudoux is too obscure and strives too much after effect. He is an *auteur difficile*. However, an analysis of Giraudoux's imagery reveals that it follows relatively few simple patterns. One of the most common patterns seems to be a sort of revitalized cliché. To try to discover the conventional expression underneath the disguise of a complicated and *précieux* metaphor is not only an intriguing pastime, but a considerable aid in understanding the mechanics of Giraudoux's style. Everyday language is composed of words and locutions of great picturesqueness and poetic possibility, qualities for which we have no regard. We are not even aware of them. They have become common coins worn dim by too much handling. But for a creative mind a word is a thrilling experience, a wealth of imagery. Giraudoux possesses a remarkable ability for perceiving the original

⁵ *Ibid.*, II, 10.

colors of a commonplace. His thinking would seem to be largely pictorial, to him abstractions as such are quite meaningless. This *penchant* towards the concrete is accompanied by an extraordinary mental agility whereby Giraudoux can completely disguise a banality by means of fanciful embroidery.

In the first group of figures which we consider the image is created by a literal interpretation of a single word, a fossilized metaphor. Word play may be noted as a characteristic device. To choose a fairly obvious one for a point of departure, one may speak of a person as being "hardened" by adversity. Thus Giraudoux describes the trials of Ulysses' sailors: "l'agitation sur les terres les plus rocailleuses les a tassés et durcis comme des sacs de sel."¹ The conceit pivots on the word *durci*; the physical sense of the verb "to harden" accounts for the comparison. In the next figure the word "movement" is interpreted in its physical sense, thereby producing a delightfully comic image. Giraudoux is observing Henri Bergson:

Il se croyait seul, mais je surveillais, je suivais chaque mouvement et chaque glissade de sa pensée, je n'en éprouvais que le vertige physique, mais comme le roitelet caché sur la tête du plus grand des oiseaux, sans voler, sans penser, j'arrivais dans son monde même une ligne au-dessus de lui.²

Nimble juggling with the literal and the figurative or with the ramified meanings of words is typical of Giraudoux's wit. Here the literal lingers in a term of endearment. "Jacques du moins était un chou. On le sentait avec son cœur frisé, ses nervures dans ses feuilles."³ The comparison seems all the more daring because *chou* as an epithet usually implies *chou à la crème* rather than a vegetable. A figurative banality may give rise to a long chain of literal variations. A character's "attachment" for another becomes clutching, soldering, even lassoing!⁴ The "opening" of a vista or vision suggests an analogy from medicine: "chacune ouvrait en moi une vision d'Europe et l'épuisait comme une glande."⁵

A great number of figures (and these are the more striking) may be reduced to a trite phrase. They follow the same pattern, which

¹ *Elpénor*, p. 94.

² *Amica America (Voyage de Jean Giraudoux)*, p. 6.

³ *Choix des Elues*, p. 278.

⁴ *Siegfried et le Limousin*, p. 203.

⁵ *Suzanne et le Pacifique*, p. 258.

we may call by paradox the "demetaphorizing" of a metaphor, since the literal meaning is restored and used as basis for an image. The expression "lighting up with a smile" is as banal and conventional as possible. By emphasis on the literal meaning of light and by borrowing from chemistry, Giraudoux camouflages the cliché thus: "ce sourire qui servit une seconde, comme une lueur de magnésium, à éclairer pour vous mon visage trop sérieux."⁶ A powerful image is projected—the cliché is revamped, completely rejuvenated. Giraudoux frequently makes use of more or less technical references to the sciences and the arts, which add to the complexity of his figures. If one were to omit the comparison "comme une lueur de magnésium," the phrase would be perfectly conventional. Giraudoux's fancy creates whimsical parallels: "Ni l'allumeur de becs de gaz, ni l'allumeur de visages n'étaient passés."⁷ A "full" heart becomes an image: "Quand je la vois, mon cœur est si gonflé que je n'y sens plus de plus."⁸ To say that the sight of passing motorists "touched Juliette's heart," Giraudoux refers to Saint Sebastian.

Les Hispano-Suiza passaient. Toutes ces belles flèches la traversaient comme le Saint-Sébastien de son église, à tous les points du corps, mais trouvant partout un cœur entier, qui montait et descendait.⁹

Once the analogy is established, the development of the conceit is simply verbal play. The expression "to cut oneself off from" is reset in concrete terms: "Il s'amputait, comme d'un organe mort, du pittoresque."¹⁰ The idea of renouncing has become a sort of surgical operation. One often speaks of a person walling himself off from others. This expression is reinforced by concrete illustration to depict a woman's behavior towards her husband: the first day "comme un paravent, le second comme une cloison, le troisième déjà en pierres qu'aucun son ne traverse, des pierres modernes, particulièrement insonores."¹¹ Mock heroic paraphrases in *Elpénor* often have a cliché basis. From this volume, the next is obviously a circumlocution for "honeyed words": "Il suffit de

⁶ *Ecole des Indifférents*, p. 130.

⁷ *Combat avec l'Ange*, p. 68.

⁸ *Ecole des Indifférents*, p. 51.

⁹ *Juliette au pays des hommes*, p. 144.

¹⁰ *Eglantine*, p. 173.

¹¹ *Chœur des Elues*, p. 142.

suivre jusqu'à leur ruche les innombrables abeilles qui sans répit paissent tes lèvres."¹² The sting of words is wittily suggested by a similar bee figure:

Ce n'est pas du miel, qu'il y a sur les lèvres du Cyclope¹ Ou alors, avec ce miel, l'abeille oublia son aiguillon Il y a de la répartie comme un diable¹³

As Ulysses is going to lash himself to the mast, his sailors cry.

O Ulysse il n'est qu'une corde solide, celle que ta parole passe au col de tes auditeurs, et pour jamais ils sont tes prisonniers.¹⁴

In other words, he "captivates" his listeners. In the next bit of flowery eloquence, the first figure is based on a literal interpretation of the common expression "to see" something when one really means "to comprehend", the second lavish image paraphrases some such banality as "to turn something over in one's mind":

Mais, quand je cligne de mon âme comme d'un œil myope pour voir toutes pensées réduites mais plus distinctes, et que je roule, diminuées sur le fond de ma mémoire comme en une émeraude concave, la mer, les naufrages et notre éternelle aventure, il m'apparaît qu'Elpénor y joua le rôle décisif, et non la Destinée¹⁵

The Cyclops ponders on recent events. Squinting with his myopic soul enables him to comprehend, to "see" the meaning of what has happened. Further reflection, turning it over in his mind, is expressed by the fustian image of rolling around seas, shipwrecks, and adventures at the bottom of the concave emerald which is his memory. The key to some of Giraudoux's most difficult passages may be found in a trite mode of expression. At first sight this next sentence may be meaningless:

Au lieu des corps opaques en Europe—Siamois, Indous—qui me renvoyaient rudement mes regards, des artilleurs français, la capote entr'ouverte, des fantassins, sous un sac dont je connaissais les moindres objets, l'épaisseur des moindres vêtements, tous ces gens pour moi transparents, et à travers lesquels—l'auto allait vite—je pouvais au besoin suivre le paysage.¹⁶

The key words of this long disjointed sentence must be "corps opaques" and "gens transparents." The meaning seems to be that while Giraudoux understands French soldiers, Asiatics are impenetrable for him. He cannot "see through" them.

¹² *Elpénor*, p. 60.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 19

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 89.

¹⁶ *Adorable Cléo*, p. 2.

Recognition of the cliché behind the image may facilitate the approach to Giraudoux and afford further insight into his peculiar genius. The great distance between the conceit of Giraudoux and its cliché prototype makes us more fully aware of the essential qualities of this author—his predilection for the concrete and his extraordinary preciosity.

LAURENCE LESAGE

The University of Oregon

KURZFORM UND LANGFORM BEI ADALBERT STIFTER

Mit dem Erscheinen der *Mappe meines Urgrossvaters* in der grossen Stifterausgabe¹ lässt uns Franz Müller einen tieferen Einblick in die Schaffensweise dieses Dichters gewinnen. Die Einleitung, die zu dem Umfang einer Monographie anwachsen musste, um den Mappe-Stoff zu bewältigen, bringt die Entwicklungsstufen der vier Fassungen von den grossen Skizzen der *Ur-Mappe* bis zum unvollendet gebliebenen Mappe-Roman. Diese ganze Interpretation zielt auf die allmähliche Gestaltung einer Romandichtung,² auf "die Wandlung von der episodenhaften Novelle zum wohlaufgebauten, idyllischen Epos."³ Daher muss es den Leser befriedigen, wenn der Herausgeber in einer Vorbemerkung zum kritischen Apparat, vom rein äusserlichen Gesichtspunkt aus, eine vollkommen entgegengesetzte Auffassung der *Letzten Mappe* bietet: "Es ist sehr reizvoll, dass ein Personen- und Ortsverzeichnis die innerste Schichtung eines Dichtungswerkes aufdeckt. Die Mappe ist ein Novellenkranz in einer Umrahmung."⁴ Man dürfte aber höchstens im Falle des Kellerschen *Sinngedicht*, dessen selbständige Novellen einen Liebesroman verquicken und entfalten helfen, den Novellenzyklus auch als Roman bezeichnen. Auch lässt sich fast von Anfang an in der Entstehungsgeschichte der *Mappe* ein konsequentes Hinzielen auf das Romanartige, auf das Grossepische beobachten. Als Stifter 1846 die *Studien-Mappe* in Vorbereitung hat, schreibt er an Heckenast. "Das Charakter-

¹ *Adalbert Stifters Sämtliche Werke* XII Reichenberg 1939 — Wo nicht anders angedeutet, wird nach der kritischen Stifterausgabe zitiert

² Ebenda, S. xxx, xxxi

³ Ebenda, S. xxxvi, vgl. auch xxxiii, xxxviii, xlv, xli, xlix, liv, cxxi

⁴ Ebenda, 345.

bild des Doktors, wie ich es mir dachte, ist nicht anders zu gewaltigen, oder ich muss seicht werden, und in gewöhnlichen Novellen- und Taschenbuch- und Liebesphrasen fortschlendern, statt einen wirklichen plastischen, nach allen Seiten tätigen, gutigen und starken Mann zu geben. . . . Der Band schliesst des Doktors Jugendleben ab, und geht (wie jeder ehliche Roman) bis zu seiner Heirat" ⁵

Interessant wäre es nun, wenn man darstellen dürfte, dass aus einer Novelle oder einer Novellenreihe ein Roman erwachst. Damit hatte man vielleicht etwas tiefer in das verschwommene Gebiet zwischen Kurzform und Langform geblickt. Hier aber im Falle der *Letzten Mappe* fragt es sich, ob die Tatsachen diese Annahme erlauben. Hullers Studie verfolgt sehr genau gehaltliche und stilistische Wandlungen in dem Mappe-Stoff. Aber über die Entwicklung der einen Gattung zur anderen in strengerem Formsinn ist auch anderes zu sagen. Vor allem muss man dabei etwas vorsichtiger mit Bezeichnungen umgehen. Denn trotzdem der Herausgeber die Teile der Urfassung verschiedentlich *Skizzen* und *Episoden* nennt, fasst er das Ganze in einem andern Sinne zusammen: "Die vergleichende Betrachtung der drei Fassungen lehrt, dass die Studien-Fassung in der organischen Entwicklung des Mappe-Stoffes zwischen zwei Endpolen liegt, und zwar in der Mitte der Entfaltung von der Novelle zum epischen Roman, Stifter steht mit der umschmelzenden Lauterung seiner Erzählung für die *Studien* an der Wende seiner dichterischen Entwicklung zu der seinem Wesen gemassen Kunstanschauung hin." ⁶ Tatsache ist aber, dass uns der Herausgeber in der Urfassung nur "Das Scheibenschliessen in Pirling" als Novelle interpretiert hat, ohne allerdings eine Abgrenzung zwischen Skizze, Episode, Novelle und Roman festzustellen. ⁷ Es würde also den wirklichen Bestandteilen der Urfassung näher entsprechen, und uns eher allgemeine Schlüsse zu ziehen erlauben, wenn man klar machte, dass die erste Stufe in dieser Entfaltung aus drei Skizzen und einer novellenartigen Erzählung besteht. Denn von strenger Novellenform kann hier kaum die Rede sein. "Das Scheibenschliessen in Pirling" ist eben eine der zahllosen Zwittergestalten des 19. Jahrhunderts, die ohne

⁵ XVI, 196.

⁶ XII, S. LV.

⁷ Vgl. XII, S. xxxiv, xxxvi—Äussere Spannung, Knappheit und rascher Abschluss wären nach Huller die Merkmale des Novellistischen.

festen Fugung den Sucher nach bestimmten Unterarten immer wieder verzweifeln oder ihn mit Robert Petsch das unabsehbare Gebiet neben den zwei Hauptarten, Schicksalsnovelle und Wendepunkt novelle, als Spross- und Zwischenformen der eigentlichen Novelle betrachten lassen.⁸

Zum Glück hat uns Stifter selbst in eindeutiger Weise über seine künstlerischen Absichten mit gewissen Teilen dieser Dichtung aufgeklärt, worauf wohl bis jetzt zu wenig geachtet worden ist. Noch auf der Stufe der angehenden *Studien-Mappe* nennt er die Erzählung des Obristen eine *Episode* "In anspruchsloser Einfachheit und in massenhaft gedrangtem Erzählen, muss ein ganzes Leben, und einer der tiefsten Charaktere liegen."⁹ Und nachdem es gedruckt ist, bleibt das Bruchstück weit hinter seinem Wollen zurück: "Ich wollte drei Charaktere geben, in denen sich die Einfachheit, Grosse und Gute der menschlichen Seele spiegelt, durch lauter gewöhnliche Begebenheiten und Verhältnisse geboten—ware es gelungen, dann hatte das Buch mit der Grosse, mit der Einfalt und mit dem Reize der Antike gewirkt."¹⁰ *Episode* und *lauter gewöhnliche Begebenheiten und Verhältnisse* sind Ausdrücke, die die dichterische Absicht genau umschreiben Gerade in dieser Hinwendung an das Gewöhnliche, das Alltägliche liegt die Vorbedingung zum Abstreifen des echt Novellistischen, der unerhörten Begebenheit Und trotzdem geht in der Geschichte des Obristen das Ausserordentliche eines Sonderschicksals nicht verloren.¹¹ Sie ist der Teil, der sich dem Romanartigen nicht zu fügen braucht, in all dem Verwandlungsprozess bleibt sie im Kerne unangetastet. Wie sie sich zum Ganzen verhält, soll noch weiter unten dargelegt werden.

⁸ Robert Petsch, *Wesen und Formen der Erzählkunst*, (Halle Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1934), 252, 255 — Wenn man die damaligen Besprechungen der Stifterschen Dichtungen vergleicht, sieht man, wie wenig auch die Zeitgenossen imstande waren, diese Gebilde zu klassifizieren *Feldblumen* wird von einem Rezensenten als "leichtgewebter Roman" beschrieben, von einem anderen "eine sehr weitläufig ausgeführte Novelle" genannt Vgl I, S lxiii

⁹ xvii, 133 Vgl dazu Franz Hülle, *Leitmotive aus Adalbert Stifters Dichtung*, (Reichenberg, 1912), 72, wo die Ich-Erzählung des Obristen in den *Studien* "eine Meisternovelle an sich" genannt wird

¹⁰ xvii, 208.

¹¹ Vgl xii, S. cxii "Nur das Kapitel Der sanftmuthige Obrist enthält einen Grenzfall, ein Ausnahme-Schicksal und trägt alle Zeichen der Herkunft aus den Jugenddichtungen um die Familie der Scharnaste an sich."

Zu diesem formumschmelzenden Problem hat Franz Huller, ohne es selber von dieser Seite aus zu verwerten, wichtiges Material hervorgeholt. In dem Abschnitt "Weltanschauung" zitiert er aus Bleistiftnotizen Stifters über den *Condor* Stellen, "die des Dichters Neigung zu makrokosmischen Vorstellungen veranschaulichen,"¹² und betont, wie gering Stifter das Einzelschicksal im Vergleiche zum Ganzen des Kosmos beachtete. Gerade hier mag wohl die tiefere Erklärung für das allmähliche Abstreifen des Kleinepischen in seiner Dichtung liegen. Sein Blick umfasst nun weit mehr als momentan auffallende Begebenheiten,¹³ und über der Beschäftigung mit einem ausgedehnteren Gebiet ermattet das Interesse an starker Profilierung des Einmaligen, des Zufälligen.¹⁴ Reste von der früheren Einstellung bleiben hie und da haften, aber im allgemeinen fügen sie sich in den ausgeweiteten Plan des neu entstehenden Kunstwerks.

Wenn man Querschnitte durch die vier Fassungen macht, fällt es sofort auf, dass zwei Bestandteile, der Form und der Funktion nach, verhältnismässig unverändert bleiben: der einleitende Rahmen und die Geschichte des Obristen. Die ersten Abschnitte "Die Antiken" der *Ur-Mappe* und "Die Alterthümer" und "Das Gelobnis" der anderen Fassungen sind weiter nichts als Rahmen oder Auftakt zum Ganzen. Als selbstständige Novellen sind sie unter keinen Umständen anzusprechen. Dasselbe gilt für alle übrigen Teile, mit Ausnahme der Obristengeschichte, denn es sind entweder lose Episoden oder idyllisch-epische Gebilde, die nicht das Gepräge der Gedrungenheit und Einmaligkeit der echten Novelle besitzen.

Zum Abrunden des kompositionellen Zieles lohnt es sich, bei der Vorfassung der *Letzten Mappe* zu verweilen und das "Nachwort" der *Studien-Mappe* neben beide Fassungen zu halten. Denn die dritte Bearbeitung des Stoffes ist weiter gediehen als die nun gedruckte *Letzte Mappe*. Obwohl diese mehr Neudichtung ist,¹⁵ gewährt uns die Vorfassung weitere Anhaltspunkte zum Aufbau des werdenden Romans. Dabei braucht man nur an wenigen Stellen

¹² Ebenda, S. xc.

¹³ Vgl. Paul Hankamer, "Die Menschenwelt in Stifters Werk," *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte*, xvi (1938), 122.

¹⁴ Vgl. xvii, 251: Stifter über Grillparzers *Armen Spielmann*.

¹⁵ XII, S. lxiy; 379.

Lücken auszufüllen, um den Plan des Ganzen zu übersehen. Die Reihenfolge der Kapitel sollte ohne Zweifel folgende sein.

I Band

- 1 Die Alterthümer
- 2 Das Gelöbniß
3. Von den zwei Bettlern
- 4 Thal ob Pirling
- 5 Margarita
- 6 Der sanftmuthige Obrist
- 7 Von unserem Hause

II Band

- 1 Von meinem Hause (nebst Schilderung des Eiswinters, die in der *Letzten Mappe* fehlt)
- 2 Das Scheibenschiessen in Pirling
[Kapitel, die die parallellaufende Geschichte von Eustachius abrunden mussten]
[Nachwort] (wie in der *Studien-Mappe*)

Die Anlage dieses konstruierten Planes lässt keinen Zweifel darüber, dass der zweibändige Roman durch einen Rahmen eingeschlossen werden sollte. Die Hauptbestandteile des neuen Gebildes entwickeln sich nicht aus Novellen, sondern, abgesehen von einer einzigen Geschichte, aus Skizzen, Episoden, epischen Idyllen. Welche Funktion hat nun die Ausnahme, das Kapitel "Der sanftmuthige Obrist"? Sie konnte als eingelegte Novelle aufgefasst werden, wie man sie in den Goetheschen Bildungsromanen findet. Aber sie ist noch mehr. Auf der Stufe der *Studien-Mappe* überragte sie an Interesse und künstlerischer Ausarbeitung die übrigen Teile. Hier aber dient sie zur seelischen Genesung des enttäuschten und schwer geprüften Doktors Augustinus. In der einleitenden Monographie nennt Franz Huller diese Geschichte "die Achse des ganzen Romans," während seine mehr stofflich-analytische Auffassung der *Mappe* diesen Teil als "Ruckerinnerung"¹⁶ bezeichnet, die sich trotz motivischer Verbindung mit dem Ganzen aus dem "Novellenkranz" herauslösen lässt. Es ist die fast unveränderte Verlagerung des Novellengutes in der Obristengeschichte die zu letzterer Ansicht leicht Anlass geben konnte. Schon Alker hat im Falle der Geschichte des Freiherrn von Risach im *Nachsommer* Stifters Geschicklichkeit in dem Einlegen einer Erzählung in einen Roman beobachtet, "wobei eine organische Verbindung erfolgt und sich ergebende retardierende Momente gut

¹⁶ XII, S. xlv; 345.

ausgenutzt werden."¹⁷ Hier aber, in der *Mappe*, ist die seelische Haltung des Zuhörers eine ganz andere als die des Heinrich Drendorf in dem Abschnitt "Rückblick." Die Lebensgeschichte des Freiherrn von Risach braucht nicht denselben lauteinenden Einfluss auszuüben, wie in der Situation zwischen Augustinus, Margarita und dem Obristen, wo sich alles noch in der Schwebelage befindet. Risachs Rückblick in seine Jugend dient zur Entspannung und Abrundung, während der Obrist die Gelegenheit ergreift, das Schicksal der jüngeren Generation indirekt zu beeinflussen. Eben deswegen ließe sich seine Geschichte nicht aus dem Ganzen herauslösen.

Betrachtet man aber das Problem vom entgegengesetzten Ende her, von der Entstehung des Kunstwerks, so sieht man, wie in beiden Fällen, dem *Nachsommer*, wie der *Mappe*, der Keimpunkt des Ganzen ein aussergewöhnliches Schicksal gewesen ist. "Das Vogelfreundbuch," wie Stifter in den ersten Anfängen den Rosenhofroman nannte,¹⁸ ist ohne Zweifel genetisch der Ausgangspunkt gewesen. Aber sein künstlerischer Formsinn richtet sich nicht auf die Auflösung eines solchen Novellenstoffes in einen Roman. Dafür hatte er eine zu hohe Achtung vor dem Mittelpunkt, dem Schwerpunkt eines dichterischen Gebildes.¹⁹ Die Idee des unvollendeten Romanes geht auch von sehr Altem aus, von der aussergewöhnlichen Geschichte eines Grafen von Scharnast. Daran aber wird nicht die Romanteknik erarbeitet. Das Rankenwerk der erweiterten Langform entsteht nicht durch das Auflösen oder Ausspinnen des ursprünglich gedungenen Obristen-Schicksals, sondern durch das Aneinanderfügen loser Teilvorgänge, die stofflich mehrere Menschengestalten zusammenbringen und im Tagtäglichen verankert sind. Der Wandlungsprozess ist also nicht, wie Hüller ihn interpretiert hat (vgl. oben Anm. 6), eine Entfaltung von der Novelle zum epischen Roman. Aus Skizzen- und Episodenhaftem, aus Zwischenformen, entwickelt sich der Romanstoff, während der eigentlich novellistische Bestandteil wesentlich der gleiche bleibt. Nur funktionell hat er eine andere Stellung, einen andern Wert im Ganzen erhalten.

MYRA R. JESSEN

Bryn Mawr College

¹⁷ Ernst Alker: *Gottfried Keller und Adalbert Stifter*, (Wien-Leipzig, 1923), 47.

¹⁸ XVIII, 147.

¹⁹ Vgl. XVIII, 84; XXII, 172

EIN UNBEKANNTER BRIEF LENZENS AN BOIE¹

Während der Jahre 1775-1777 hatten J. M. R. Lenz und H. C. Boie eine ganze Reihe von Briefen gewechselt,² der hier abgedruckte Brief aus meinem Besitz bildet nicht nur den Abschluß des früheren Briefwechsels, sondern auch das Seitenstück zu dem von Freye und Stammler unter No 317 veröffentlichten Briefe Lenzens vom 6 April 1780 an F. J. J. Bertuch. An diesen, wie an Boie, getraut sich Lenz zu schreiben, aber "Dem Trumvirat in W. (d. h. Goethe, Herder, Wieland) darf ich nicht bitten, mich zu empfehlen. Sie haben zu viel zu thun, um an mich zu denken." (Freye und Stammler II, 159).

S T

Schatzbarster Freund!

Neue Situationen, ofnen neue Aussichten und knupfen die alten Verbindungen freundlich wieder an. Ich nahm Abschied von Ihnen, als ich der Trödelbude der Welt müde, mich der Natur in der stillsten Schweitz in den Schooß warf. Sie hat mich in mein Vaterland zu fuhren gewußt, wo mir jede ehemalige Verbindung neuen Werth erhält. Ich bin bisher von allen litterarischen Neuigkeiten durch meine Schuld abgeschnitten gewesen. Sie werden mich verbinden, wenn ich deren einige und von Ihrer Hand erhalten kann, die für mich den Stempel der Zuverlässigkeit mehr als eine andere fuhrt, da ich zu entfernt bin, als daß sich Leidenschaften zwischen uns einmengen konnten. Also werden Sie auch von mir welche erhalten, an denen Ihnen gelegen seyn konnte. Doch bitt ich zum Voraus, keinen andern Gebrauch davon zu machen, als sich mit meinen Verhältnissen wird vertragen können, woruber mir die Zuverlässigkeit und Unbestechlichkeit Ihres Karakters bekannt ist.

Was macht also zufoererst Vater Klopstock den ich durch ein Mißgeschick, wie sovieler Edle auf meiner Reise habe verfehlen müssen. Und unser furtrefliche Leibarzt Zimmermann³ von dessen Sohn ich noch aus Zurich gute Nachrichten mitgenommen. Es ware unaussprechlich schade um eine der feinsten und schonsten Seelen unsers Jahrhunderts gewesen, vielleicht durch bloßen Kutzeln des feindseeligen Witzes, der lang unter uns den Ton gegeben, so ganz erdrückt zu werden. Ach wenn wird Thalia wieder

¹ Brief in Quart 4 Seiten, Wasserzeichen J Honig & Zoonen, ohne Adresse oder Postvermerk.

² Vgl. *Briefe von und an J. M. R. Lenz, Gesammelt und herausgegeben von Karl Freye und Wolfgang Stammler*; 2 Bande, Leipzig 1918, wo dreissig zwischen den beiden gewechselte Briefe aus den Jahren 1775-1777 abgedruckt sind.

³ Johann Georg Zimmermann

lachen können, die nur das faule Fleisch wegätzt und der edlern Seele neue Lebenskräfte giebt Sie die im Gefolge der Bacchanten und Menaden das Angesicht verhüllen muß, wie jener Grieche bey der Aufopferung seiner Tochter

Von Ihrem Museum ⁴ weiß ich fast nichts mehr so wenig als vom Merkur,⁵ da wir hier periodische Blätter mit näherer Beziehung aufs Vaterland haben Doch konnten sie sich vielleicht mit Ihnen zu ähnlichen Zwecken vereinigen, ohne einander im Debut ⁶ zu schaden, da die deutsche Litteratur, wenn sie mehrere Angelegenheiten Rußlands aufnahme, hier vielen Eindruck macht Vielleicht gibt es in unseren entferntesten Gegenden, achtere Deutsche als bey Ihnen Verzeyhen Sie mir diese Impertinenz, die wie alle Machtsprüche auch ihren Theil Wahrheit hat, da vielleicht unter keiner Regierung sich Expatriirte von allen Ständen und Fähigkeiten so genau an ein ander geschlossen und so freundliche Behandlung erfahren

Ich muß schließen, weil mir kaum soviel Zeit übrig bleibt, Ihnen zu sagen, daß hier ein ehemaliger Eleve von Ihnen, Herr Legationsrath Claudes ⁷ mir bekannt worden und ich mit ihm näher bekannt zu werden wünschte um Ihnen mit mehr Eindruck versichern zu können, daß ich nicht aufhören kann zu seyn Ihr

verbundenster Fr u Diener

J M R LENZ

Petersbg. d 5ten April 1780.

Wie befindet sich Herr Burger—was machen Pfeffel ⁸ und Schlosser,⁹ die zu weit entfernt von mir sind, um sie zu erreichen Doch bitt ich dem letzten, Herrn Hofrath Schlosser zu schreiben, daß er sich eine unrichtige Vorstellung aus meiner eben so unrichtigen Nachricht von meiner gegenwärtigen Situation macht, über die ich ihm, sobald ich es bestimmter thun kann, schreiben werde Doch konnte das Kadettenkorps in Berlin und Herrn Rammlers ¹⁰ Situation in demselben ihm ein richtigeres *point de vue* abstecken helfen.

Von Herrn Bause ¹¹ der Ihnen diesen Brief vielleicht selbst abgiebt,

⁴ Boies *Deutsches Museum* erschien von 1776-1791.

⁵ Wielands *Teutscher Merkur* erschien von 1773-1810.

⁶ *Debut*, anstatt *Debit*, Absatz, Vertrieb

⁷ über den Legationsrat Claudes war nichts zu ermitteln etwa im Jahre 1789 redet Lenz ihn als *Lieber Freund Claudes* an (Freye und Stammerl No 348, Bd II, S. 225).

⁸ Aus den Jahren 1775, 1776 sind drei Briefe von Lenz an Konrad Pfeffel erhalten.

⁹ Johann Georg Schlosser, Oberamtmann in Emmendingen im Breisgau, auf welche Äußerung Schlossers Lenz hier anspielt, weiß ich nicht Schlossers Brief vom 9. März, 1778, an Lenzens Vater (No 298 bei Freye und Stammerl) scheint der spateste zu sein, der uns erhalten ist.

¹⁰ Ramler war *maître de la philosophie* am Kadettenkorps in Berlin, mit dem Titel Professor. Die Stellung ließ ihm viel freie Zeit

¹¹ Herr Bause war Lehrer an der Petri-Schule in Petersburg; vgl Lenzens Brief an Bertuch vom 6. April 1780, bei Freye und Stammerl No. 317.

vielleicht zuschickt, habe Ihnen noch nichts sagen können. Er geht nach Dessau,¹² aus einem Zuge der Gemüther die mit gleichem Erfolg auf gleiche Zwecke arbeiten. Nur daß sein Standpunkt verschieden und ihrem Journal viele Mannichfaltigkeit und Nutzen mehr geben wird, in das ei Beytrage von Petersbg. aus liefern will.

Er wird Ihnen meine Adresse sagen, doch besser wars, Sie schickten ihm Ihren Brief zu.

W. KURRELMMEYER

HAUPTMANN'S "SO LANGE GOTT NIMMT, NEHM ICH AUCH"

Among the earliest writings of Gerhart Hauptmann, known to us only by hearsay because they were either destroyed or lost, none has a more puzzling or ominous title than the item "So lange Gott nimmt, nehm ich auch." Schlenther is the original source and referred to it with these words.¹

Im Juli 1888 schickte er [Hauptmann] von Zurich aus eine kleine humoristische Skizze an Julius Stettenheim und bot sie diesem für seine Monatsschrift² "Das humoristische Deutschland" an. Diese Novелlette, die den seltsamen Titel führte "So lange Gott nimmt, nehm ich auch" hat Stettenheim dem unbekannten Dichter nach Zurich zurückgeschickt. Seitdem ist sie verschwunden.

The supposition that Hauptmann's strong social consciousness as revealed in his first dramas was responsible for this very early effort has naturally been made. The only full discussion of the first attempts of the young writer, appearing in "Gerhart Hauptmanns naturalistische Anfänge,"³ bears out this theory.

¹² In Dessau wollte Bause mit den Lehrern am Basedow'schen Philanthropin in Verbindung treten.

¹ Paul Schlenther, *Gerhart Hauptmann*, Berlin, 1898, 55. In the revised edition of 1922 Eloesser omitted the reference. Viktor Ludwig in his bibliography, *Gerhart Hauptmann Werke von ihm und über ihn*, Neustadt, Schlesien, 1932, 3, lists the title.

² Julius Stettenheim (1831-1916) edited this monthly since its beginning in October 1885 after being associated for some years with a satirical humorous paper "Berliner Wespen." Later Stettenheim parodied successfully *Die versunkene Glocke* (1898) and *Fuhrmann Henschell* (1901).

³ Felix A. Voigt, *Hauptmann-Studien*, Breslau 1936, I, 49.

Leider können wir die Anfänge Hauptmanns auf dem Gebiet der Humoreske, die uns vielleicht eine Vorstufe zu seinen späteren Komodien gezeigt hatten, nicht mehr selbst lesen. Von Zürich aus schickte er eine wohl kurz zuvor geschriebene Erzählung mit dem Titel "Solange Gott nimmt,nehm' ich auch" an Julius Stettenheim für dessen Zeitschrift "Das humoristische Deutschland." Sie ist nie gedruckt worden und scheint in der Redaktion verlorengegangen zu sein. Ob sie—wie Schlenker (S. 55) andeutet—eine polizeiwidrige Tendenz gehabt hat, konnte ich nicht feststellen.⁴ Wir besitzen allerdings von Hauptmann aus dieser Frühzeit noch eine Arbeit, die ihn uns als Satiriker zeigt, die er später seiner ganzen zurückhaltenden Wesensart nach hat fallen lassen.

Yet we have all been misled by this very suggestive title. Hauptmann had in this instance no thought of social or economic injustices. On the contrary he had simply attempted a humorous sketch based upon an incident he found in his reading. In Fontane's *Unterm Bunbaum*,⁵ the widower Abel Hradtschek is comforted by his cronies with humorous anecdotes of happy remarriages when he had just buried his wife.

Eine [Erzählung] davon, die beste, handelte von einem alten Hauptmann von Rohr, der vier Frauen gehabt und beim Hinscheiden jeder einzelnen mit einer gewissen trotzigsten Entschlossenheit gesagt hatte "Nimmt Gott, so nehm ich wieder."

Hauptmann gave his imagination free reins and expanded the story. According to his own recollections today, "handelt es sich um einen Totengräber, der schon sieben Frauen gehabt habe, die alle gestorben seien, nun wolle er zum achten Male heiraten. Also der Ausspruch."⁶

WALTER A. REICHART

University of Michigan

⁴ In another article, "Aus Hauptmanns frühen Tagen," Sonderdruck aus dem 107. Jahresbericht für 1934, *Schlesische Gesellschaft für vaterländische Cultur*, p. 116, Voigt also refers to this refusal: "Stettenheim witterte schon im Titel etwas polizeiwidriges und lehnte ab."

⁵ Theodor Fontane, *Gesammelte Werke*, Berlin, 1920 I, 554. The story was first published in the Grote'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Berlin (23. Band der Sammlung von Werken zeitgenössischer Schriftsteller), after running serially in *Die Gartenlaube*, 1885, 533 ff. (Nrs. 33-41).

⁶ "Im Uebrigen sagte mir Gerhart Hauptmann, es sei wohl eine ziemlich dürftige Sache gewesen." From a personal letter of F. A. Voigt about a discussion of this matter with the poet.

THE CHARACTER "LIBERUM ARBITRIUM" IN THE
C-TEXT OF *PIERS PLOWMAN*

In an interesting note in *Review of English Studies*¹ Dr. Mabel Day has discussed the influence of Duns Scotus's philosophy on the conception of the character Liberum Arbitrium in the B-Text of *Piers Plowman*. In the B-Text, it will be remembered, Liberum Arbitrium rents from Piers Plowman the land on which grows the Tree of Charity, and he helps Piers protect this tree from the attacks of the Devil by striking at the Devil with one of the three piles supporting the tree. The three piles represent the Holy Trinity, and in using the third pile Liberum Arbitrium is said to be aided by the Holy Spirit.² Thus, points out Dr. Day, the Scotist doctrine of the primacy of the will is illustrated "Man's free will is circumscribed only by the divine will, hence, when Christ has applied his passion to the defence of man, Liberum Arbitrium is left in control, with the help of the Holy Spirit"³

The greatly enlarged role of this same character Liberum Arbitrium in the C-Text has not, however, been explained with equal clarity. In the C-Text, Liberum Arbitrium instructs the dreamer about charity in a long section of the poem called by Skeat "The Vision of Free-Will and of the Tree of Charity,"⁴ and, at the very beginning of that section, describes himself to the dreamer in a rather puzzling passage. Also, instead of using only one of the piles supporting the Tree of Charity, Liberum Arbitrium wields all three of them when the flesh, the world, and the Devil attack the tree. Skeat was puzzled by Liberum Arbitrium's description of himself,⁵ and Dr. Day by mere human Liberum Arbitrium's ability to wield all three of the piles representing the Holy Trinity, i.e. the piles representing the Father and Son as well as that standing for the Holy Spirit.⁶

Let us take Skeat's difficulty first. Here is Liberum Arbitrium's description of himself (C-Text, xvii, 183-198) .

¹ "Duns Scotus and 'Piers Plowman,'" *RES* III (1927), 334

² *Piers Plowman*, B-Text, xvi, 16-17, 46-52

³ P 334.

⁴ *The Vision of William Concerning Piers the Plowman*, ed W W Skeat, Oxford, 1886, II, xc

⁵ *Ed cit*, II, 215.

⁶ *MLR*, xxiii (1928), 23-4.

And the whyle ich quyke the cors cald am ich *Anima*;
 And whenne ich wilne other wolde *Animus* ich hyhte,
 And for that ich can and knowe cald ich am "mannys Thouht"
 And whan ich make mone to god *Memoria* ich hatte,
 And when ich deme domes and do as treuthe techeth,
 Then is *Racio* my ryhte name "Reson" in Englissh,
 And whenne ich fele that folke telleth my furste name is *Sensus*,
 And that is witte and wisdom the welle of alle craftes
 And when ich chalange other nat chalange chepe other refuse,
 Thanne am ich *Conscientia* cald godes clerk and hus notarie,
 And when ich wol do other nat do goode dedes other ille,
 Than am ich *Liberum-arbitrium* as lettrede men tellen,
 And when ich loue leely oure lord and alle othere,
 Then is "leel Loue" my name in Latyn that is *Amor*,
 And when ich flee fro the body and feye leue the caroygne,
 Then am ich a spirit specheles and *Spiritus* thenne ich hote

Now, although it is, as Skeat says, "hard to see how all these various names can be applied to Free Will," the explanation of such an identification is to be found in medieval psychology. John Damascene had considered *liberum arbitrium* or free choice a *universal* power of the soul, to be identified with all other powers of the soul, and this theory had been followed by a number of thirteenth century theologians. The following texts of John Damascene and Hugh of St. Cher, for example, give the same identification of free choice with other powers of the soul as found in *Piers Plowman* and thus explain the passage.

John Damascene *Libero ergo arbitrio appetit, et libero arbitrio vult et scrutatur, libero arbitrio inquit et iudicat; libero arbitrio disponit, libero arbitrio eligit, et libero arbitrio impetum facit et libero arbitrio agit et operatur semper in his que secundum naturam sunt.*

Hugh of St. Cher. *Solutio Quidam dicunt quod liberum arbitrium est tres vires anime. rationalis, irascibilis, concupiscibilis, sed habet unum nomen, quia ille tres vires quandoque conveniunt in unum actum. Quibus videtur consentire Joannes Damascenus ubi dicit liberum arbitrium appetit, liberum arbitrium vult; lib. arb. inquit et perscrutatur; lib. arb. iudicat; lib. arb. disponit; lib. arb. eligit, lib. arb. impetum facit; lib. arb. agit, lib. arb. operatur, quasi diceret liberum arbitrium exercet actum omnium virium.*⁷

⁷ John Damascene's *De fide orthodoxa*, translated by Burgundio of Pisa, quoted in Dom Odon Lottin's "La Psychologie de l'Acte Humain chez Saint Jean Damascène et les Théologiens du XIII^e Siècle Occidental," *Revue Thomiste*, xxxvi (1931), 636 (the reference to the original is *Patrologia Graeca*, xciv 945 B-C, but medieval theologians knew Damascene through

A second point to be noted in Liberum Arbitrium's description of himself in his statement of his function (C-Text, xvii, 173-7) :

'Wher-of serue 3e?' ich seide 'syre *Liberum-arbitrium*?'
 'Of som tyme to fyghte,' quath he 'falsnesse to destruye,
 And som tyme to suffre bothe sorwe and teene,
 Layke other leue at my lykyng chese,
 To do wel other wikke a wil with a reyson'

Judging from the emphasis upon destroying falseness and suffering sorrow, this Liberum Arbitrium, unlike the scamp Free Will (i. e. Self-will) of the morality *Hickscorner*, is a will that possesses the power to choose the good in preference to the evil. The C-Text author stresses the *moral* qualifications of the free act of choice, and defines *liberum arbitrium* by its final cause or end, rectitude—which is exactly what St. Anselm had done earlier in his definition "libertas arbitrii est potestas servandi rectitudinem voluntatis propter ipsam rectitudinem," in which he had been followed by a number of theologians.⁸ Thus Liberum Arbitrium's description of himself, upon closer scrutiny, reveals the learning and theological

Burgundio's translation), Hugh of St. Cher, quoted in Dom Lottin's "La Théorie du Libre Arbitre Pendant le Premier Tiers du XIII^e Siècle," *Revue Thomiste*, xxxii (1927), 378. For thirteenth century discussions of the problem of whether *liberum arbitrium* is a universal power or a unique power of the soul, see the latter article. St. Thomas Aquinas took it as a unique power.

⁸ St. Anselm, *Dialogus de libero arbitrio*, c. 3 (*Patrologia Latina*, CLVIII, 494 B). Those who followed St. Anselm in his emphasis upon the moral qualifications of the act of choice gave what came to be called 'theological' definitions of free choice, as contrasted to the 'philosophical' definitions which stressed the element of reason in the act of choice. Those who gave 'theological' definitions emphasized the will's lack of efficacy in its present state and need for grace in order to choose the good, following a tradition that goes back to St. Augustine and St. Paul (Rom vii 18); those who, like Abelard, gave 'philosophical' definitions interpreted *liberum arbitrium* as the free movement of the reason, following a tradition that goes back to Boethius. The C-Text author seems to belong to the 'theological' group. St. Thomas Aquinas reconciles the two traditions. See Etienne Gilson, *The Spirit of Mediaeval Philosophy*, tr. A. H. C. Downes, New York, 1936, pp. 304-23, especially 316-17, and Dom Odon Lottin, "Les Définitions du Libre Arbitre au Douzième Siècle," *Revue Thomiste*, xxxii (1927), 104-7, 218. Definitions of followers of St. Anselm are given in Dom Lottin's article, on the pages cited. Among those in the 'theological' tradition, it may be added, was Peter Lombard, in his *Sentences*.

subtlety that have been suggested as distinguishing characteristics of the C-Text reviser⁹

In view of the theological precision shown in C's definition of free choice, I am convinced that the role taken by *Liberum Arbitrium* in the remainder of "The Vision of Free-Will and of the Tree of Charity" cannot be so confusing as Dr. Day believes, although I am less confident of the correctness of the interpretation of this role that I shall offer. Here is Dr. Day's criticism of the part played by *Liberum Arbitrium* in the C-Text:

What did C mean by *Liberum Arbitrium*? In xvii, 158 (not in B) he introduced him as one of the aspects of *Anima*, and as the leader of *Activa Vita*. Hence he represents man's free will. But as the teacher of Jesus Christ [in C xix, 138], he cannot be so identified; nor again when he uses the three piles [supporting the Tree of Charity and representing Trinity], for man's free will could not have brought into action the power of the Father and the passion of Christ. We must conclude that C did not recognize how carefully B had defined the limits of man's free will according to Duns Scotus.

My answers to these objections are as follows. To the first. Assuming that when *Liberum Arbitrium* is called the teacher of Christ the reference is to the humanity of Christ, and remembering that by *liberum arbitrium* the C-Text means a *liberum arbitrium* which has attained its end, rectitude, I do not see anything illogical in this role of *Liberum Arbitrium*'s. To the second. In the C-Text (although not in the B-Text) the Tree of Charity, as its names *Imago Dei* and *True Love* suggest, stands for the rational human soul turned toward God and consequently bringing forth the fruit of charity.¹¹ This soul has been turned toward God, i. e. made

⁹ Cf. J. M. Manly, "*Piers the Plowman* and Its Sequence," *Cambridge History of English Literature*, II, 31; Theophilus D. Hall, "Was 'Langland' the Author of the C-text of 'The Vision of Piers Plowman'?" *MLR*, IV (1908), 12.

¹⁰ "The Revisions of 'Piers Plowman,'" *MLR*, XXIII (1928), 23-4. Dr. Day is certainly wrong in taking the C-Text *Liberum Arbitrium* as only "one of the aspects of *Anima*" (italics mine); cf. *Liberum Arbitrium*'s explicit identification of himself with all the faculties of the soul in the passage quoted above, and Skeat's remark about it.

¹¹ *Piers Plowman*, C-Text, XIX, 7, 9. Matthew of Aquasparta tells us that "*Anima enim rationalis est imago Dei*" (*Quaestiones disputatae de cognitione*, qu. V, quoted in Gilson's *Spirit of Mediaeval Philosophy*, p. 467), and St. Augustine and St. Anselm write that the soul becomes the image of God especially when it remembers, understands, and loves God (St. Augustine, *De Trinitate*, XIV, 12; St. Anselm, *Monologium*, c. 67).

righteous, through the influence of grace—i. e., the Tree is supported by the Holy Trinity.¹² When evil threatens in the shape of the flesh, the world, and the Devil, grace cooperates with free choice to defend the soul; or, as the allegory has it, *Liberum Arbitrium* avails himself of the help of the Holy Trinity, the three piles. The passage is an allegory of the cooperation of grace and free choice in the defense of the righteous soul against evil.

The *role*, then, of *Liberum Arbitrium* in the C-Text, as well as the *description* of this personified faculty of the soul, bears witness to the learning and theological training of the C-reviser.¹³ The whole C-Text conception of the faculty of free choice, I may add, is the orthodox Catholic one, far removed from the theological determinism of Bradwardine which is sometimes pictured as exercising a great influence in fourteenth century England.¹⁴

The University of Maine

GEORGE SANDERLIN

If loving God is more emphasized in the name True Love than remembering and understanding Him, love is what was stressed by the masters of Cistercian mysticism in their teachings about the image of God (see Gilson, *op cit*, pp 269 ff)

¹² Cf C XIX, 9

“‘The tree hihte Trewe-loue,’ quath he ‘the trinite hit sette’” If it be objected that the Tree of Charity cannot stand for the soul because in C XIX, 113 ff Adam, Abiaham, and others are described as among the fruit of the tree, the answer is that in C, although not in B, a change in the conception of the Tree is clearly indicated by line 68, “Adam was as tree and we aren as hus apples” After this line the Tree assumes a genealogical character, and might be called the Tree of Adam

¹³ Another example of C’s greater interest in theological questions than B’s is furnished by C xv, 23 ff (B XII, 61 ff) Here where B gives a common generalization about grace being found among humble people, C presents a brief but precise analysis of the relations of grace and the human will, distinguishing carefully the role of grace in preparing the will to choose good (cf St Augustine, *Enchiridion*, c 32, and *De praedestinatione sanctorum*, c 5)

¹⁴ This has been brought out by Manly, *CHEL*, II, 31, and is clear from the passage quoted above, C XVII, 173-7, in which the spontaneity of *liberum arbitrium* is stressed In that passage, for example, the phrase “a wil with a reyson” suggests that the act of the will is accompanied by, rather than in any way necessitated by, the reason, and recalls St Bernard’s “Porro voluntas est motus rationalis . . . Habet sane, quocunque se volverit, semper rationem comitem, et quodammodo pedissequam. non quod semper ex ratione, sed quod nunquam absque ratione moveatur” (*Tractatus de gratia et libero arbitrio*, c 2, *Patrologia Latina*, CLXXXII, 1003 B).

AN ORIENTAL THEME IN THE *FRIÐÞJÓFS SAGA*

A number of years ago the Old Norse *Friðþjófs Saga*, sufficiently well known even to those who are not specialists in the literatures of Scandinavia, was subjected anew to a searching analysis. The strange motives of the old king Hring ceding his young wife to a friend, the wholly un-nordic sex taboo attached to a sanctuary of Balder, and the various generosity tests were shown to be essentially foreign to the civilisation of Northern Europe and to hark back to the Semitic East, where parallels are not wanting, both in the *Arabian Nights* and in isolated Arab stories.¹ The author of the study in question was however unable to find an Eastern analogue for one of the most striking episodes of the saga.

Friðþjóf, deprived of his beloved Ingibjorg, who has been given in marriage to the old king Hring, disguises himself as a saltburner and betakes himself to Hring's court, where he is hospitably received.

Then it comes to pass that the king and queen are bidden to a feast, and Hring invites Friðþjóf to accompany them. On the way Friðþjóf warns the king that the ice over which they are driving is not safe. Soon the sled breaks through the thin crust, and Friðþjóf rescues it and its occupants. The king says "That is a good rescue, and Friðþjóf the Bold could not have done better."

Some time after the king says to the saltburner "Let us go out to-day and look about, for this is a fair landscape." Then they go out together and come to a certain wood. The king feels sleepy, lies down and is soon snoring. Friðþjóf sits by him. He draws his sword, looks at it intently, and then flings it away out of reach. At once the king wakes up and says "It happens now that various things come into your mind." And he adds that he has known all along who his guest has been.

The reader knows of course that the story ends by Hring conveniently dying, leaving to Friðþjóf his possessions and his beloved Ingibjorg.

Gould correctly observed that the episode of Friðþjóf's test is exotic, but he could recall only one Arabic parallel from the *Nights*,² where however the rascally Beduin yields to the temptation and kills his sleeping benefactor. There is a far more striking analogue in the *Tripitaka*, i.e. a Chinese version of Buddhist apoloques going back to the beginnings of Buddhist missionary propaganda. It reads as follows:³

¹ C. N. Gould, "The *Friðþjófs saga* an Oriental Tale," *Scandinavian Studies and Notes*, VII (1921-22), pp. 219-50.

² Burton, III, 111.

³ E. Chavannes, *Cinq cents contes et apoloques extraits du Tripitaka chinois*, Paris, 1910-11, I, 38 ff.

There once lived in India a kind-hearted and benevolent king who, on being threatened with war by a neighbor greedy for land and power, preferred to abdicate rather than to sacrifice the lives of his subjects.⁴ Accompanied by his son and heir presumptive, he leaves his capital. To help a needy brahman, he has himself delivered up to his enemy, the prize set upon his head serving to relieve the holy man. He is condemned to die at the stake. Before his end he has a chance to see his son, who has managed to approach him in disguise, and to admonish him always to forgive his enemies.

Disguised as a servant, the son is admitted first into the household of one of the royal ministers, then into the royal household itself. Owing to his ability, he is in time promoted to the post of minister and entrusted with the protection of his royal master.

One day the tyrant goes hunting, accompanied as usual by his minister. Having been separated from his suite, he finds himself alone with his confidant in a pathless wilderness. Overcome with fatigue, he hands to him his sword, puts his head on his knees and falls asleep. Seeing his enemy in his power, the disguised prince unsheathes the sword and is about to slay the sleeper when he remembers the admonition of his dying father, and he resolutely puts his sword back into its sheath. The king wakes up and says that he just had a dream in which his enemy Tch'ang-cheng (such is the Chinese form of the name of the Indian prince) was about to cut off his head. The minister ascribes this dream to the demons haunting the wilderness, and the king falls again asleep. Twice the same scene is repeated, but the third time Tch'ang-cheng flings away the sword, saying aloud that out of regard for his dead father he pardons his enemy. The king wakes up, saying that he has dreamt that Tch'ang-cheng has forgiven him. Thereupon Tch'ang-cheng makes himself known and tells his story. The tyrant repents and returns to him his father's kingdom.

The similarities between these two stories are fairly obvious: in both the hero is exiled by one more powerful than himself, in both he returns in disguise and enters the service of his rival, in both the latter, who trusts himself into his power either because he is convinced of his opponent's nobility of character or because he does not suspect his identity, gives him an opportunity to slay him; in both the hero resists the temptation, finally flinging away the sword lest he succumb after all to evil thoughts; in both, at last, this gesture leads to the *dénouement* of the story which in both versions ends happily.

⁴On this theme cf. J. Dutoit, *Jatakam* (1908), I, 220; II, 454; III, 15; Tawney-Penzer, *The Ocean of Story*, London, 1924-28, VII, 51; A. Bastian, *Die Völker des östlichen Asien*, Jena, 1866-71, II, 157; v, 95, Philostratus, *Vita Apollon*, II, 20.

Since the *jataka* can have reached Scandinavia only from the Near East the facts pointed out fully confirm the conjecture of Dr Gould and constitute further evidence for the mediaeval migration of story themes from the Orient to the Scandinavian North.

ALEXANDER H KRAPPE

Princeton, N J

PURITAN

Among the historian Stowe's marginalia the following sentence on the early use of the term *Puritan* occurs

About that tyme [1567] were many congregations of the Anabaptysts in London, who cawlyd themselves Puritans or Unspottyd Lambs of the Lord ¹

This statement of Stowe's, says *The New English Dictionary*, "is probably an error, for otherwise it [*puritan*] appears in early use always as a term of reproach used by opponents, and resented by those to whom it was applied"

Stowe's opinion, nevertheless, receives corroboration from a very high authority on religious schisms King James I, in the address "To the Reader" which is prefaced to the 1603 edition of *Basiliikon Doron*, says:

First then, as to the name of Puritanes, I am not ignorant that the style thereof doeth properly belong onely to that vile sect amongst the Anabaptists, called the Family of loue, because they thinke themselves onely pure . Of this speciall sect I principally meane, when I speake of Puritans, diuers of them, as *Browne*,² *Pem'y* and others, hauing at sundrie times come into Scotland, to sow their popple amongst vs and partly indeede, I giue this style to such brain-sicke and headie Preachers their disciples and followers, as refusing to be called of that sect, yet participate too much with their humours, in maintaining the aboue-mentioned errorrs, not onely agreeing with the generall rule of all Anabaptists, in the contempt of the ciuill Magistrate, and in leaning to their owne dreams and reuelations; but particularly with this sect, in accounting all men profane that sweare not to all their fantasies, in making for euery particular question of the policie of the Church, as great commotion, as if the article of the Trinitie were called in controuersie"³

¹ *Three Fifteenth-Century Chronicles*, ed. James Gairdner, Camden Society, N S. XXVIII (1880), 143.

² Robert Browne, the separatist Stowe, likewise, mentions Browne as a Puritan

³ *The Political Works of James I*, ed C. H. McIlwain, *Harvard Political*

The similarity between the concept underlying our present term, *fellow-traveller*, and King James' reason for including among the Puritans those who refuse "to be called a sect, yet participate too much with their humours" is indicative of the kind of caution which must be exercised by historians when using or defining *Puritan* and similar Tudor-Stuart religious labels.⁴

Northwestern University

R. E. BENNETT

PEARL. 'INLYCHE' AND 'REWARDE.'

Mr. Sledd's interpretation ¹ of *Pearl* (ll. 603-604)—

for þer is vch mon payed inlyche,
wheþer lyttel oþer much be hys rewarde—

as meaning that "all the blessed are rewarded alike, since they are all in the presence of God, but that they are not rewarded equally, since they differ in their spiritual capacity to realize His presence," surely rescues the poet from that divided state of mind imputed to him in Carleton Brown's essay, "The Author of *The Pearl*, Considered in the Light of his Theological Opinions," *PMLA*, xix (1904), 115-153. Theologians aside, the author of *The Pearl* had a precedent for his idea in the work of Dante, who, in *Paradiso*, xxxi and xxxii, had depicted the 'like' beatitude of all the saved through their enjoyment of the Beatific Vision, indicating distinction of reward by means of the great symbol of the Rose with its various ranks and gradations. The *Pearl* poet's contemporary, Walter Hilton, moreover, would have had no difficulty in understanding Lines 603-604, for he himself had something of the same nature to say on the subject. In the *Scala Perfectionis*,² he writes.

Classics, I (Cambridge, 1918), 7. H. M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism* (Chicago, 1939), 488-89, cites and accepts Stowe's statement, saying that *Puritan* was "probably used originally by the adherents of the Separatist groups to indicate the thoroughness of their reformation." Knappen also cites *Papers Relating to English Affairs, Preserved . . . in the Archives of Simancas Elizabeth*, II (1894), 7, but he fails to mention King James.

⁴One might also compare our recently coined *communitari* with King James' *Puritan-papists*, which he applied to Jesuits (McIlwain, p. 126, cf. p. xxii).

¹James Sledd, "Three Textual Notes on Fourteenth-Century Poetry," *MLN*, LV (1940), 381.

²Walter Hilton, *Scala Perfectionis* (ed. Cressy, reprint, 1901) London, Art and Book Company, pp. 84-86.

Thou shalt understand that there be two rewards in the bliss of heaven, which our Lord giveth to chosen souls. The one is *Sovereign and Principal*, and is called *Essential Reward*, and that is the knowing and loving God according to the measure of charity given by God to the soul while she lived here in mortal body. This reward is best and *Sovereign*, for it is God Himself, and is common to all the souls that shall be saved, in what state or degree soever they live in holy Church, more or less, according to the quantity and the muchness of their charity in this life, what degree soever they live in.

Then, having enumerated certain "special good deeds, which a man doth voluntarily over that he is bound to do," he says, "When they are done truly for God, they are excellent, and shall have a special reward, each man in his degree, in the bliss of Heaven." This special reward he calls "*Secondary or Accidental*," and as an instance of it mentions the reward of a prophet which will be Daniel's, "at the last day of doom," over and above the "Sovereign blessed reward of the love and sight of God."

MARY V. HILLMANN

College of St. Elizabeth

AN EMENDATION TO A. E. HOUSMAN'S TRANSLATION FROM EURIPIDES' "ALCESTIS" (962-1005)

A. E. Housman's translation from Euripides' *Alcestis* contained one misprint in its original publication, and with one exception that misprint has been carried through in all subsequent printings. The mistake may be found in the second line:

Far-seeking and deep debate, . . .

which should read

Far seeking and deep debate, . . .

The hyphen in "Far-seeking" should not be there, for, to quote Housman's own words (from a private letter), "*seeking* is a noun substantive."

Housman was extremely exacting in punctuation; this emendation, heretofore unknown, should therefore be of some value to students interested in his poetry and his scholarship.

HARRY J. RUNYAN

University of Wisconsin

REVIEWS

Poesía y Estilo de Pablo Neruda. Por AMADO ALONSO. Interpretación de una poesía hermética. Buenos Aires: Editorial Losada, S. A. (S. f.). Pp. 294. \$5. moneda argentina.

Amado Alonso se dió a conocer hace muchos años como uno de los más aventajados discípulos de la escuela de filólogos que se formó en el Centro de Estudios Históricos de Madrid, señoreada por la figura ilustre de Ramón Menéndez Pidal. Trasplantado a Buenos Aires ha forjado en aquella Universidad el foco más importante de trabajos lingüísticos de todo el mundo hispano-americano ha publicado estudios filológicos de sumo valor, y ya puede ver su labor continuada en la obra de discípulos de mérito. Todo eso le ha ganado justo título de maestro en filología hispana.

Al aplicar sus luces al profundo comentario de la obra poética de un poeta aun joven, Pablo Neruda, Amado Alonso sigue la actitud de la nueva filología (Vossler, Spitzer, Curtius, etc.) que inclina su interés sobre la obra de la poesía contemporánea con el mismo celo y rigor que si estudiara a un clásico remoto en el tiempo. Actitud que se nos representa como ejemplar, en lo que contradice a aquella postura de recelo y miedo que solía sentir gran parte de los universitarios y académicos españoles en cuanto ponían los ojos sobre los libros de sus contemporáneos. Al fin y al cabo es la tradición clásica de los filólogos del Renacimiento, que, nutridos de ciencia antigua, no desdeñaban el enfocarla sobre las creaciones de sus contemporáneos. Así un Tamayo de Vargas, un Brocense, un Salzedo Coronel, por no citar más que españoles.

Al escoger a Pablo Neruda como tema, Amado Alonso tenía muchas y buenas razones. La primera, la esencial es el ser Neruda un poeta grande y auténtico. La segunda que Neruda y su poesía están, en los momentos actuales, ejerciendo una influencia en todo el mundo de habla española que ningún otro poeta americano había alcanzado desde Rubén Darío. Y otra, y no menor, es que el fenómeno poético que personifica Neruda es tan frondoso, que ofrece al crítico no menos tentaciones de exploración que las que una selva virgen americana brindaría al estudioso de las ciencias de la naturaleza. Oscura, como floresta, riquísima como ella en floraciones extrañas, bellas unas y malsanas otras, la poesía de Neruda invita a aventurarse por sus profundidades en busca de ejemplares curiosos de la actividad poética.

El método que emplea, sin renunciar sistemáticamente al punto de vista histórico-cultural, traído con acierto en varias ocasiones, por ejemplo al referirse a las influencias de la filosofía de Schopen-

hauer y de la poesía del uruguayo Sabat Ercasty, es el estilístico y lingüístico.

El propósito es aclarar algunas de las oscuridades de la poesía de Neruda. Los versos de este poeta resultan enigmáticos, muy a menudo. Pero, afirma con gallardía Amado Alonso, "la calidad de una poesía no se mide por lo fácil ni lo difícil que sea de comprender." Y su libro es una magnífica prueba de su comprensión de una poesía honda y oscura y un valioso auxilio para que la comprendan los demás.

¿Qué clase de poeta es Neruda? Un romántico, un archirromántico. Es la suya "una poesía escapada tumultuosamente de su corazón, romántica por la exacerbación del sentimiento." Y un expresionista, "por el modo eruptivo de salir" de esa poesía. La evolución poética de Neruda se definiría como "una progresiva condensación sentimental por ensimismamiento, un cada vez más obstinado anclaje en el sentimiento, en lo hondo de sí mismo, desentendiéndose cada vez más de las estructuras objetivas." Este desentenderse es la causa capital de la oscuridad de su poesía. El sentimiento de Neruda va sufriendo, paralelamente, una agravación de su misma índole ensimismada, que le lleva de la melancolía hasta la angustia.

Es característica de cabo a cabo, en la poesía de Neruda, una visión desintegrada de lo real. En ella coincide, dice Amado Alonso, con el ahínco de desintegración propio de nuestra época, apreciable en tantas formas de arte, impresionismo, cubismo, expresionismo, literatura de James Joyce, de Marcel Proust. Pero en Neruda la desintegración, es algo más que una manera de contemplar lo real, o de tratar la realidad: "es un modo de ser la realidad." La vida de todo lo vivo es un estarse muriendo, la existencia de lo consistente es un estarse deshaciendo." Y en medio de este fatal desagregarse de todo lo real el poeta, trágicamente, siente la lucha entre el afán de perpetuidad, que es el poetizar, y la inexorabilidad de la destrucción, que es la vida. Se explica así el sentimiento de angustia subyacente en tanto poema.

En otro capítulo estudiáanse las relaciones entre intuición y sentimiento, que en el poeta clásico son de equilibrio. En Neruda, por el contrario intuición y sentimiento están en perpetuo desequilibrio, y de ahí se deriva tanta dificultad de entender. Neruda no atiende a la realidad de lo intuído, sino al estado sentimental que en él provoca esa realidad. Se ensimisma, en ella. ("El ensimismamiento consiste en repetidas inmersiones en el sentir.") Por consiguiente, dice Alonso ¿cuál será el recto camino para entender las tiradas de imágenes en que irrumpe el sentimiento del poeta? Instalarnos en el mismo foco desde el cual son lanzadas estas imágenes, esto es en la entraña misma del sentimiento genitor de cada poema. No vale el querer entender intelectivamente, primero, las construcciones externas, y pasar de ellas al sentimiento, sigue Alonso. Porque esas construcciones externas no serán comprensibles como no lleguemos

a ellas desde el sentimiento que las provoca. Lo primero es "entregarse al clima sentimental" propuesto. Creemos que las afirmaciones que aquí hace el autor y su distinción entre comprensión práctica y poética son de pertinente aplicación a toda clase de poesía de la llamada oscura, sobretudo la de origen simbolista o neorromántico. Y, además, representan una de esas verdades ya axiomáticas que no puede pasar por alto el comentador o el estudioso de poesía. Frente al viejo sistema de intentar comprender un poema oscuro frotando y refrotando sus superficies con análisis racionales, como si se le quisiera quitar su capa de oscuridad, muchos creemos en el nuevo método de introducirnos, por obra de *lectura total*, más que de inquisición analítica, en el centro mismo del poema, y desde allí, ir atravesando sus capas sucesivas hasta llegar a su exterior, que entonces se nos aparecerá claro, en función de todo lo que antes tuvimos que cruzar y que nos explica, ¿hora, el porqué es así, por fuera.

Empleando ese procedimiento Amado Alonso en varios capítulos nos da interpretaciones magistrales de algunos poemas, como *Barcarola*, *Galope muerto*, excelentes pruebas para mí de la superioridad de esta forma de entender el poema sobre la antigua *explication de texte*, producto de la crítica positivista.

El ritmo, en Neruda tiene por misión principal la de guardar y expresar el ímpetu del sentimiento. La sintaxis, muy compleja, es borrosa, sin dibujo, y permite a mucha materia fonética y sintáctica que quede en el poema sin elaborarse estéticamente, sin incorporarse armónicamente a la creación poética. Por lo cual, concluye Alonso, tenemos a veces la impresión de hallarnos ante una poesía "traducida en verso," pero con dificultades invencibles. Esta sintaxis no es caprichosa, se la explica uno insértandola en la visión desintegradora que ya citamos. Desde luego que la forma de una poesía nacida de esa visión y realizada con ese ritmo y esa sintaxis, es esencialmente confusa. Hay en Neruda una "hostilidad programática a la forma." Pero esta ausencia de forma de la primera época del poeta, esa "poesía de la libre aventura" es sucedida más tarde por lo que llama Amado Alonso "idea formante la forma como creación." La fuerza inspiradora del poeta evoca la presencia de ciertas imágenes, y al hacerlo va dándose forma a sí misma. Es la emoción "no descrita o pintada, sino presentada y actuando." Las observaciones antedichas sobre la forma, con otras que no podemos extraer, si no constituyen una teoría orgánica de la forma poética en general, cosa que sin duda no se propuso hacer el autor relumbran de atisbos y sugerencias sobre este problema capital de la creación poética y son de lo más denso del libro.

Estudia por último Amado Alonso algunas fases típicas de la fantasía poética de Neruda, con sus correspondientes cristalizaciones en recursos estilísticos. En las imágenes comparativas prescinde de la expresión de lo comparado. Usa lo concreto material, por lo

inmaterial. Particulariza lo genérico. Emplea símbolos insistentes, algunos de los cuales como *rosas, palomas, mariposas, abejas, peces, sal, nombre, campanas, uvas, pelos, medias, notarios*, etc. son glosados con copia de ejemplos por el autor, en una extensa sección del libro. La objetivación de lo subjetivo se corresponde con lo inverso, la objetivación de lo subjetivo, en muchos casos. Hay en Neruda escapadas frecuentes a visiones de radio cósmico y una manifiesta tendencia a la desmesura en las imágenes. La abstracción se utiliza como recurso de intensificar la visión. Objetos heterogéneos, *disjecta membra*, se encuentran derramados por los poemas. Y con mucha frecuencia el pensar poético de Neruda se presenta con una constitución onírica," donde la exaltación triunfante es arrrolladora y donde la angustia adquiere extremos de pesadilla." La combinación y entrecruzamiento de todos estos elementos que yo apunto, y que Alonso estudia tan sagazmente, explica la dificultad y extrañeza de la poesía nerudiana.

Pero Alonso no deja esta extrañeza suelta y flotante en el aire, como hija del capricho. Neruda según él, es un índice de su época. Confusión, desintegración, tocan las raíces mismas de la vida de nuestro tiempo. Ningún poeta lleva con tanta dignidad — ni el futurista, ni el dadaísta, ni el superrealista — la representación de nuestro tiempo, donde todo se desintegra, por el que circula la angustia metafísica, y en el cual las gentes, apartándose de creencias heredadas, se embarcan en aventuras extremistas, entre desesperación y miedo. "Es la contextura misma de nuestra época desquiciada, resonando entera en los versos de un poeta que al principio no parecía tener otra justificación que la arbitrariedad individual."

Y esto es lo que hace el libro de Amado Alonso. Probarnos a través de un proceso donde se conjugan pensamiento riguroso, concienzuda técnica filológica, experta sensibilidad poética, que la poesía de Neruda, y, por extensión podríamos decir, la poesía oscura y difícil de nuestros días cuando es grande, como la de Neruda, no es voltereta arbitraria, cabriola irresponsable, sino voz de muchas almas que viven los mismos sentimientos, sin saberlos decir.

Y, nada más estimulante, más cargado de esperanza, que este espectáculo del libro de Amado Alonso una poesía de desorden, sometida al orden que la inteligencia alumbra en todo lo que llega, por fin, a comprender. Poesía soberbiamente desintegradora, sobre una realidad desintegrada, la de Neruda, dice Amado Alonso. Pero ese fenómeno así descrito, al final del libro queda *integrado*, gracias a la penetración del crítico en las líneas de claridad, que nacen, como las del alba, de todo acto de profundo entender.

PEDRO SALINAS

Dostoevski, the Making of a Novelist. By ERNEST J. SIMMONS.
London, New York, Toronto. Oxford University Press, 1940
Pp. x + 416 \$3 00.

This volume by Dr. Simmons is a landmark in the studies of Dostoevski in the English language, for hitherto, as the author well notes, far too many scholars have treated his novels as texts on which to write tracts on morals, religion, and psychology. Dr. Simmons has taken a different point of view and following some of the Russian critics, he has sought to trace rather the genesis and development of ideas in the mind of the author as shown by the copious notebooks which he has left in the preparation of his various works. The publication and careful study of this material is obviously of the greatest importance for all those who would eliminate tracts about Dostoevski and study his achievements.

Perhaps, however, the ancient authors were more fortunate in that they left no notebooks. Let us imagine, for example, the difficulties which we would encounter if we possessed all the preliminary drafts of a play by Shakespeare or Euripides. The problems that confront scholars and critics would often be cleared up but many new ones would be created. That is the trouble with Dostoevski. The present volume shows us how he created his characters but there are many questions that still baffle solution, largely because we know the way in which the preliminary forms originated.

At the same time Dr. Simmons is very much influenced, as he admits (p. 391), by the views of Pereverzev on dualism and the Double. It is undeniably true that Dostoevski from at least his early story, *The Double*, to the end of his career was much interested in the problem of dualism in character. Yet it may well be asked whether the views of Pereverzev were not influenced originally by a desire to justify Dostoevski in the eyes of the Soviet authorities and whether the political views of Dostoevski were not the starting point of much of his views as to the Double type. It is painfully easy to divide the main characters into Meek characters, Self-willed characters, and Doubles, but this perhaps overlooks the fact that the Double becomes automatically any figure which has the struggle between mind and heart, between two conflicting ideals, between two moods at any stage in his career. There is a great gulf between Versilov and Ivan Karamazov and it is to be noted that Dostoevski himself applies the word Double only to the former and regards the second as undergoing a conflict, as do many of the great figures in the world of literature.

Perhaps the touchstone for much of Dostoevski is to be found in that enigmatic story, *The Double*, from his early years and the complexities of that story, a Petersburg Poem as he subtitles it, are not adequately handled either by Dr. Simmons or by Pereverzev.

The work of Bem in Praha raises many other questions which must sooner or later be handled

This volume also ignores the problems inherent in Dostoevski's use of other authors and his relations to Pushkin, Gogol, and older Russian writers as well as such European authors as Schiller. There are many points here which still need careful consideration, before we can fully understand how and why Dostoevski wrote as he did, especially in view of the fact that his final copy often differs markedly in emphasis and detail from the sketches in the notebooks.

Dr. Simmons writes (p. 383), "His mind was with the reasoning of Ivan, his heart with the precepts of Zosima." Perhaps this antipathy of mind and heart was even more fundamental than some of the dualistic debates in reasoning and in feeling that we find elsewhere. Perhaps Dimitry Karamazov is a double of the heart or a representative of conflict in the heart as Ivan is of the mind. Perhaps there is some new aspect that needs to be analyzed before we can get to the real Dostoevski and the real meaning of his works.

Nevertheless this work is a far more serious attempt to understand the author than most of the previous critics have made and the book is invaluable for all those who desire to treat Dostoevski as literature and to find out the qualities that have made him great and given him his popularity. Of all the writers of the nineteenth century Dostoevski offers by far the most complicated problem, if we would reach to the man and his essence. He is not a prophet but a keen analyst delving into the human spirit more deeply than perhaps he himself realized. Yet for this very reason we must be grateful to Dr. Simmons for making the material of this book available in English and for many keen and searching comments on the technique and methods of a remarkable writer and character.

CLARENCE A. MANNING

Columbia University

Le Mystère poétique. Par PIERRE TRAHARD. Paris, Boivin & Cie, 1940. Pp. 176.

L'auteur d'un ouvrage en trois volumes sur *Mérimée*, d'un autre en quatre volumes sur *Les maîtres de la sensibilité au XVIII^e siècle*, d'un récent volume sur *La Sensibilité révolutionnaire*, sans compter plusieurs autres études qui font de lui un des maîtres de la critique littéraire de ces dernières années, M. Trahard vient de s'attaquer au délicat problème de la "Poésie pure". Il s'entoure de précautions, écrivant dès la première page, "investigation meurtrière, j'entends dont on revient meurtri de n'avoir rien trouvé."

"Jamais, dit-il un peu plus bas, les théories n'ont été plus nombreuses qu'aujourd'hui," alors que, pourtant, non seulement une définition de la poésie pure n'existe pas, mais que d'ailleurs "toute définition est inutile" (p. 9).

Cependant, on ne ferme pas ce livre sans grand profit. On y trouve recueillies un grand nombre d'opinions émanant de noms célèbres, Rimbaud, Mallarmé, Bremond, Valéry, Cassou, Aragon, Royère, etc. Et s'il y a encore bien des mots qui sont *blab, blab, blab* comme dirait Stuart Chase,¹ l'abondante documentation de M. Trahard aura toujours le mérite de dispenser de fastidieuses recherches ceux qui ne s'intéressent pas particulièrement au problème, et cependant tiennent à être au courant du débat. Son attitude semble être plutôt favorable au mouvement de la poésie pure, et d'approuver ceux qui dénonceraient comme "faux poètes" des Musset, Banville, Coppée, Jammes, Rostand, Zamacois, Géraudy. On fait valoir comme argument qu'ils sont des poètes "faciles." Est-ce suffisant et n'entend-on pas par là, au fond, qu'ils sont réalistes? Mais à ce taux-là que dire de ces vers de Valéry cités par l'auteur lui-même

Les cris aigus des filles chatouillées,
Les yeux, les dents, les paupières mouillées,
Le sein charmant qui joue avec le feu (p. 29)

Ou ce mot du champion du "musicisme intégral," Jean Royère "la poésie est pour nous, non du nectar, mais du sang" (p. 27).

Quels sont les causes qui ont amené à l'idée de la poésie pure? D'une façon générale on peut dire que c'est la réaction contre le réalisme en littérature et en art, et contre l'intellectualisme en philosophie. Et ici M. Trahard entend spécialement le bergsonisme, tout mysticisme ("La poésie, mon Dieu, c'est vous," Maillain), le symbolisme, la psychanalyse, sans compter cubisme, dadaïsme, futurisme, surréalisme, voire arts plastiques, la musique et la danse,—bref tout ce qui est intellectuellement articulé. Toutes ces attitudes ou notions prétendent d'ailleurs remplacer le réalisme superficiel d'hier par un réalisme plus profond puisque, comme le veut Bremond, "la création poétique est le passage du *moi* de surface au *moi* profond" (p. 62), ou comme l'exprime le "poète pyrogène" P. Albert-Birot:

Je ne sais où je finis, où je commence,
Et je fais le tour infini
Du monde infini que je suis (p. 81).

¹ Tels "la technique de Michel-Ange est celle de Dante, et l'art de Rodin celui de Hugo" (p. 116) "Une danseuse est non seulement un corps, mais une âme rythmée" (p. 126) Représenter "le mystère de toute chose par le mystère du langage" (p. 128) Opposer à la formule de Verlaine "De la musique avant toute chose," la formule plus large "De l'émotion avant toute chose" (p. 133) "La grande sagesse doit être mystique, et elle l'est, si clairement exprimée et pensée qu'elle puisse être" (p. 135). Etc

Tout cela pousse à l'évaporation, à la poésie pure, c. à d. sans contenu substantiel.

M. Trahard ne paraît pas vouloir cacher son inclination personnelle au valérisme, lequel combine, avec une poésie qui n'est que du son, un intellectualisme aigu ("Tel poème a commencé en moi pas la simple indication d'un rythme, qui s'est peu à peu donné un sens," p 123) Tout le chapitre X est un exposé admirable, en quelques pages, de l'essence du valérisme, et ce n'est pas la faute de l'auteur si le sentiment de l'incompatibilité demeure dans l'esprit du lecteur entre intellectualité et poésie non intellectuelle. En somme, d'accord en ceci avec Rodin, Valéry insiste sur l'art conscient "S'il rejette le rêve, l'enthousiasme, la naïveté, le hasard, l'intuition, il recommande tout ce qui, dans l'acte créateur, relève de l'intelligence, de l'esprit, de la raison. La poésie est une œuvre de peine et l'art, de calcul et de volonté" (p 147). On lit encore, p. 151. "Pour Valéry, comme pour H. Larson, il existe une logique de la poésie, qui est la logique déliée, subtile de l'intuition, car l'intuition il ne l'accepte que domptée." Faut-il être étonné que R. de Souza "réfute avec force le faux classicisme de Valéry, dur, lourd, rigide, calqué sur la poétique de Boileau, d'E Poe, et ce qui est pire de J.-B. Rousseau et de Delille."

Pour moi le jeu d'échec ressemble au jeu des vers,

a déclaré celui-ci (p 152)

Un point qui n'est certainement pas sans intérêt: Au début de son livre, M. Trahard fait une distinction entre des poètes révoltés (tels Byron, Rimbaud, Mallarmé) et des poètes révolutionnaires; mais plus loin il constate qu'un groupe important des poètes modernistes plus récents—les surréalistes entre autres—ont insisté pour rapprocher organiquement leur notion de poésie pure avec leurs activités révolutionnaires. Le problème mériterait d'être approfondi davantage. On voit bien le manque de rapport nécessaire entre révolté et révolutionnaire dans des cas comme ceux de Byron, Rimbaud, Mallarmé, mais on voit beaucoup moins en quoi consiste exactement le rapport affirmé par ces modernistes entre pensée pure et révolution.

ALBERT SCHINZ

University of Pennsylvania

REES, GARNET: *Remy de Gourmont, essai de biographie intellectuelle*. Paris, Boivin et Cie, 1940. Pp. x + 278 + 279-312.

Another proof of the recurrent attraction exerted by Remy de Gourmont on the Anglo-Saxon mind (cf. Havelock Ellis, T. S. Eliot, Ezra Pound, Richard Aldington, all translators and propa-

gandists of G.'s work) is the appearance at this time, when interest in G. is at a low ebb, of Prof. Rees' (Univ. of Wales) "intellectual biography" of the author. Professional critics of G. (Coulon, Legrand-Chabrier, Beaunier, *et al.*) have had nothing to say on his account since the discussion by René Taupin of G.'s importance to Imagism and American poetry (ca 1929). Two theses (Bencze, Toulouse, 1929 and Jacob, Illinois, 1931) have had the defects, according to Rees, of concentrating exclusively on G.'s esthetics in the first case and of failing to point out G.'s chronological development as a thinker in the second. Chronology forms the framework of Rees' work. G.'s career is divided into periods of youth and literary débuts, symbolism (1889-1896), a transition period (1896-1898), and maturity (1899-1915). Rees finds it possible to reconstruct the steps by which G. passed from an initial literary conservatism (*Merlette*, 1886, with its echoes of Romanticism and Flaubert), through a phase dominated by the symbolist esthetic of individualism and introversion (*Litanies de la Rose*, 1892, the *Livres des Masques*, etc.) to a period of intellectual self-analysis after which G.'s philosophic attitude became fixed. The two principles of G.'s mature outlook are, following Rees, an ironic skepticism (emotionally reinforced by the symbolist faith in relativism and liberty of thought) and a complete acceptance of physiological psychology (buttressed by extensive amateur research). Rees stresses what he terms G.'s philosophic "attitude" rather than any metaphysic implicit in his work. G. emerges from Rees' study as a sort of Diderot of modern times, an enquiring spirit in search of originality in art and engrossed by the historic and contemporary interplay of ideas. Instinctive opposition to the *idées reçues* of his age prompted G. to seek out heterodoxies in all fields: Latin poetry of the Middle Ages, Molière's *immoralisme*, La Fontaine's realistic opportunism, the free thought of the *libertins*. G.'s chief characteristics appear as anti-sentimental epicurianism (*Une Nuit au Luxembourg*), skeptical psychological materialism (*La Physique de l'Amour*), and a talent for the free play of thought (*Promenades philosophiques*). The eclipse of G.'s fame in France since the first World War Rees attributes to the indifference of the public toward G.'s *manière symboliste* and toward a work of independent philosophic detachment tainted with the same skepticism as that found in the works of G.'s similarly discredited contemporary, Anatole France. G., however, remains in Rees' image a lofty peak in the critical sierra of our age, only temporarily obscured by clouds which will soon roll back to disclose a towering figure.

Rees has undertaken the difficult problem of reconstructing an "intellectual biography" in a persuasive and on the whole praiseworthy fashion. In his extensive culling of citations from G.'s texts, the critic has tried to steer a perilous course between textual

paraphrase on one hand and formal literary criticism on the other, not without running afoul of each in his effort to approach G.'s mind through his works. Certain repetitions and insistences slow down the progress of the argument. The use *passim* of the phrase "esthétique symboliste" without giving a satisfactory definition of it lends an unfortunate vagueness to the reiterated assertion of the importance of G.'s symbolist period in his critical development. The whole of Chapter II (*Autour du Symbolisme*) might conveniently have been either omitted, or assimilated into Chapter III (*Gourmont et le Symbolisme*), since it retraces already familiar material and contains no original contribution to the subject. As a recapitulation of G.'s intellectual and literary achievements, Rees' work is, despite excessive detail, excellent. The reader may, however, take issue with some of Rees' value judgments, as well as with his interpretation of the causes and significance of G.'s dwindling influence. More attention to G.'s reputation in the early 1900's among the avant-garde writers would have disclosed a growing antagonism to G., not *because of* his "Symbolism" but *because of* G., despite his stylistic *manière symboliste*, actually failed to appreciate and to understand what the new literature was to discover in symbolism, namely, visionary poetry (cf. G.'s mistaken estimates of both Rimbaud and Lautréamont). G. paid lip-service to Mallarmé, but shows no evidence of having grasped his real significance. Baudelaire he could encompass, Baudelaire is logical, and G. hated the non-logical with Flaubertian bitterness. G.'s "pre-Freudian" psychology was the product of reason alone, a convenient mental frame of reference, a *fausse clef* to the problems of human behavior. Face to face with non-intellectual, onerific art, G. balked and retreated into Homais-like conservatism. Rees' otherwise admirable study might have been enlivened by the presence of something without which few critical works seem complete and just: a sense of the possible deficiencies of his hero, a touch of friendly antagonism. Closer scrutiny might have revealed to Rees a G. *homo duplex*, at once the apostle of modernism and the outmoded reactionary.

Mr. Rees' bibliography is admirably constructed and seems complete. Several *lettres inédites* by G. are quoted in the text, and consultation of documents preserved at the B. N. and elsewhere has permitted the author to make a number of factual additions to G. biography. If Rees' expressed purpose of furnishing to future literary historians "la matière brute de synthèses plus générales sur . . . Remy de Gourmont" seems both modest and overconfident, the explanation lies less in the fact that Rees' own synthesis is quite excellent than in our new impatience with the old "building-block" theory of scholarship, according to which each research worker contributes his brick to the edifice to be erected by the Master Builder who never appears. *Chacun sa synthèse* would

appears to be at once a counsel of desperation and the plainest common sense

BRUCE A. MORRISSETTE

Washington University

Le Roman du Comte de Poitiers. Publié par BERTIL MALMBERG.
Lund Gleeup, 1940 Pp. 210.

This edition of *Le conte de Poitiers* forms the first volume of Alf Lombard's new series, *Études romanes de Lund*. It is to be followed by editions of Benoit's *Vie de Thomas Becket*, Wace's *Vie de saint Nicolas*, *Le roman du Mont-Saint-Michel*, and *Le bestiaire d'amour rimé*.

My own text of *Le conte de Poitiers*, published some four years ago, contains a certain number of defects, most of which—along with some inexistent ones—have been pointed out by Jeanroy and Långfors in their respective reviews¹. Profiting by these reviews, M. has produced a text which is certainly in some respects an improvement on mine. Unfortunately, however, it is by no means devoid of inaccuracies, and some of M's editorial practices are, to say the least, questionable. It is indefensible, for instance, to retain *qui* for *que* (vs. 20 *et al.*) on the grounds that the copyist confused *qui* and *cur* and that the latter might be used accusatively. The accusative use of *cur* was not frequent and occurred only under special conditions (cf. Foulet, *Petite syntaxe*, § 253). On the other hand, confusion of *qui* and *que* is one of the most common scribal errors, arising doubtless from the circumstance that the abbreviation mark in *que* was frequently so written that it resembled a superscribed *i*. Incidentally M. has gone astray a number of times in the resolution of abbreviations: vs. 707, read *Par*, not *Por*; vs. 1224, read *Por*, not *Par*; vs. 192, read *graillie*, not *garallie*; vs. 657, read *puis*, not *pour*, vss. 1386, 1457, read *cascone* instead of *cascone*, a non-existent form. M. is mistaken in indicating that *les*, written above the line in vs. 640, is in a more recent hand than the copyist's. Despite M.'s assertions to the contrary, the readings of vss. 188 and 216 are indubitably *jetes* and *l'ai c.* respectively; the former, of course, must be corrected, and the latter possibly also. M.'s corrections in the following verses are not only unnecessary but, for the most part, indefensible despite having in some cases been recommended by Jeanroy or Långfors: vss. 172, 246, 309, 515, 594, 795-6, 1463, 1529. Contrary to M.'s belief, all of vs. 1806 must be rejected as not belonging to the text, his explanation not only lacks transcriptional probability, but is invalidated by vs. 1087, which shows that the duke could not have figured

¹ Jeanroy in *Neuphil Mitt*, xxxix (1938), 199 and Långfors in *Ro.*, lxxiv (1938), 409. Mr. M. was unaware of the reviews by Mrs. Frank in *MLN*, lxxx (1938), 65 and by Desonay in *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, xvi (1937), 965

in the enumeration preceding. As indicated in my edition, there is certainly a lacuna after vs. 1203. M.'s doubt of this on the ground that two successive couplets having the same rime would be "très anormal" is obviated by the next four verses, 1204-18, which present precisely that "abnormality." In any case, an odd verse in a poem which rimes in couplets would certainly be much more strange. Vss. 863 and 1237 do not, as M. indicates in his notes and on p. 96, contain an invocation to the deity, he has simply mistaken plural vocative forms for the singular, the poet is addressing himself in both these places to his readers or auditors. The punctuation is erratic and often confusing, instances of faulty punctuation are too numerous for mention here.

In his introduction, M. devotes a number of pages to summing up what has been written by others on the Wager Cycle and on the literary influences which the author of *Le conte de Poitiers* underwent. He has nothing new to add here despite the impression to the contrary given in his foreword. He attempts next, not very convincingly, to revive a theory, first advanced by Ferd. Wolf, holding that the *Roman de la Violette* does not derive directly from *Le conte de Poitiers* but that the two descend from a common source.² Relying upon rather vague historical parallels, he would place the date of the *Conte de Poitiers* in the neighborhood of 1240; this, I feel, is at least fifteen or twenty years too late. The greater part of the hundred-odd page introduction is devoted to a linguistic study which treats together—one may imagine the resulting confusion—the language of the poet and that of the copyist. Although one may question the need for printing so lengthy a treatment of the language of a brief, mediocre poem presenting practically nothing in the way of linguistic particularity and although one may doubt the propriety of including in the introduction of an edition much that is dragged in here, the linguistic study is, nevertheless, M.'s soundest contribution.³

FREDERIC KOENIG

University of Arizona

² I shall examine this point in detail in a forthcoming study of the Wager Cycle.

³ The preceding review was already in type when I received a copy of C. Fahlin's interesting study, "Les sources et la date du *Roman du Comte de Poitiers*" (reprinted from *Studia Neophilologica*, XIII, 181-225). This article began as a review of Malmberg's edition, but grew into a thoroughgoing examination of the interfilations of the *Conte de Poitiers*, *Macaire*, *Doon de la Roche*, *Gaydon*, *Parise la Duchesse*, and *Florence de Rome* with the objective of invalidating M.'s contention that the *Violette* is not directly dependent upon the *Conte de Poitiers* and of establishing more satisfactorily the date of the latter. While some reservations must be maintained concerning the sequence he attempts to establish for the works studied, Fahlin has demonstrated beyond any doubt the interdependence of these compositions and has made thereby an important contribution to the study of the Cycle of the Woman Falsely Accused.

Richard Crashaw a Study in Baroque Sensibility. By AUSTIN WARREN. Louisiana State University Press, 1939. Pp. xv + 260. \$3.00.

This is an admirably informed and discriminating study of a poetic achievement which most students even of the period still need a good deal of help to appreciate. The author is equipped, as are few scholars, with both the knowledge and the critical tact essential for the reconstruction of the poet's context of "time and place, associates, instruments of piety and sensibility, and predecessors in kind." The opening chapter, "The Laudian Movement and the Counter-Reformation," sets the standard of the book. It is a compact and scrupulously documented groundplan of a highly complicated spiritual and aesthetic scene. The next chapter, "The Man," the fruit of much patient and ingenious literary detection on the author's part, affords an indispensable summary of all that is known and most of what can safely be conjectured on that tempting subject. The third chapter is a thoroughly instructed survey of one important aspect of baroque art, characteristically precise in its definitions and stimulating in its implications. In like manner in the fourth chapter Mr. Warren's mastery of the rhetoric of the time makes his analysis of the technical problems and resources of Crashaw's verse sure and illuminating. The final chapter on the poet's reputation since his day helps to complete the bridge between his world and ours.

Much of the distinction of this book lies in the fact that a study of sensibility which might so easily have been subjective and impressionistic is, in fact, to so high a degree objective and judicial. Yet one may not unreasonably wish that a critic of Mr. Warren's resources had at certain points in the discussion of the poet's personality hazarded a little more of inference and interpretation. So too, in the final appraisal of the poetry as poetry, one could wish for a little more. The many suggestions of critical standard and observation that from time to time glance off these meticulously directed pages, reveal the wealth of insight which the author could have brought to a warmer, less restrained interpretation of a type of poetry to which most of us are in no danger of bringing too much enthusiasm.

As regards the general orientation of the book, two points should receive more attention. In some of the most ecstatic of Crashaw's poems, like the hymns to the Nativity and to Saint Teresa, there are touches of homely tenderness that should not be forgotten in our appraisal of him as a baroque artist. More stress should be laid, too, on the fact that while certain aspects of the baroque were more accessible at home to Crashaw and his friends than has usually been understood, others remained to them ideal and academic precisely because they received them in a secondary and more remote fashion, more free at once from the attenuation and the vitality of

an immediate and continuing tradition. That is to be taken into account when one tries to value both the purity and the rarity of the poet's atmosphere.

HELEN C WHITE

The Huntington Library

Coleridge the Talker, A Series of Contemporary Descriptions and Comments. Edited by RICHARD W. ARMOUR and RAYMOND F. HOWES. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1940. Pp xvi + 480. \$4.00.

All students of Coleridge will be interested in this collection of contemporary descriptions of his conversation. Mr. Armour and Mr. Howes have included in one volume materials from over a hundred different sources, throwing the light of as many various minds upon the legendary glamour of Coleridge as a talker. The number of reminiscences is a measure of Coleridge's central literary influence and fame, especially in the Highgate period, during which two-thirds of these writers of memoirs made his acquaintance. The number of visitors has also the value of giving many different points of view, but with an overwhelming unanimity of opinion in regard to Coleridge's genius, which was apparent, it seems, in the most casual contacts with strangers and sufficient to make even the greatness of his published work appear utterly inadequate to represent his powers. Most of these opinions are worth consideration. Coming as they do from persons of strong literary interests, they generally show critical perceptiveness and are expressed frequently with a vividness which gives immediate life to Coleridge's personality. This is the sort of thing which the scholar needs to make literary biography live in his imagination.

It may be suggested that the scholar already has access to these materials. This is not the case, however, if one considers practice rather than theory. Some of the items are previously unknown to bibliographers of Coleridge, many are accessible only in the very largest libraries, and all of them require search if they are to be found in their various sources. They are presented here with an apparatus of bulky but very readable original research which gives them twice their value. There is an excellent introduction of nearly a hundred pages which discusses Coleridge's conversation and its relation with his prose works, his poetry, his lectures, his personality and influence. This is one of the most valuable and readable critical essays on Coleridge in existence. In addition there are head-notes to every selection, giving the essential facts which the reader requires for an adequate knowledge of the author quoted. Finally there are seventy-six pages of notes, which clear up difficulties, add information too bulky for head-notes, and quote modern

critics or scholars and shorter bits of Coleridge reminiscences. In other words this is not only a very valuable anthology, but an important work of original and thoroughly competent research on a significant subject.

THOMAS M. RAYSON

University of Nebraska

Maske und Gesicht in den Werken Conrad Ferdinand Meyers. Von CAROL KLEE BANG. Hesperia Nr. 20 Baltimore. The Johns Hopkins Press, 1940. Pp. xii + 190. \$2.50.

Der erste Teil dieser sehr eingehenden und sorgfältig analysierenden Studie gibt eine systematische Zusammenstellung der Masken, unter denen die dichterischen Gestalten Meyers einander gegenübertreten. Die Reihe beginnt mit der einfachen, melodramatischen Schurkenmaske, die besonders in den Frühwerken erscheint. Über eine Reihe von Variationen, wie die schalkhafte Maske, die Hoflingsmaske, wird die Technik verfolgt bis zu ihrer raffiniert vollendeten Ausgestaltung in der zweideutigen Ratselmaske des Pescara and der allegorischen Maske der Angela. Besonders wertvoll für die Interpretation sind auch die Nachweise solcher Verhüllungen des unmittelbaren Ausdrucks in den Meyerschen Gedichten.

Ein zweiter Teil der Studie beschäftigt sich mit der Verhüllungstendenz des Dichters, wie sie in den Briefen und den wenigen Rezensionen erscheint. Der Nachdruck der Untersuchung liegt jedoch auf der technischen Seite, d. h. dem Gebrauch der Maske im Werke selbst. Ein kurzer Abschnitt wird zwar der verkappten Selbstdarstellung gewidmet, aber fast ganz auf die Gedichte und *Huttens letzte Tage* beschränkt, obschon Conrad Ferdinand Meyer selbst die historische Novelle dem Zeitroman ausdrücklich vorgezogen hat, "parce qu'elle me masque mieux et qu'elle distance davantage le lecteur." Auch wird mehrfach angedeutet, dass die Verhüllung in den früheren Werken weniger häufig ist, und dass sie in den späteren zu einer raffinierten und komplizierten Technik wird. Man vermisst darum ein Kapitel, in dem diese Entwicklung in grossen Zügen zusammengefasst wird. Eine nachträgliche Behandlung dieser Frage in einem Artikel wäre sehr erwünscht. Im Kapitel über "Gesicht des Menschen und des Dichters in Briefen" wird der allgemein angenommene Dualismus in der Persönlichkeit Meyers mit dem Problem der Arbeit in Beziehung gesetzt. Doch bedarf diese an sich durchaus begründete Deutung des Charakters einer Ausweitung über das Persönliche hinaus. Denn bei aller Subjektivität und Abgeschlossenheit Conrad Ferdinand Meyers ist auch er historisch gebunden, und seine historische Novelle ist in

gewissem Sinne, wenn auch nicht Zeitroman (was Meyer selbst ablehnt), so doch Zeitdokument.

Diese Bemerkungen sind jedoch nicht als Kritik der ausgezeichneten und sorgfältigen Analyse gemeint, sondern als Andeutungen, wie die Resultate der Arbeit weiter ausgebaut werden konnten.

F. W. KAUFMANN

Oberlin College

Das Redentiner Osterspiel. Textausgabe von WILLY KROGMANN.
Leipzig, S Hirzel Verlag, 1937. Pp. 96 (Altdeutsche Quellen,
Heft 3).

The Redentin Easter Play is coming to be more and more widely recognized as by far the best work of its *genre* in German literature. In fact, its unity, trenchant style, and character analysis mark it as an outstanding drama in the medieval literature of all Europe. It is gratifying therefore to find that a new critical edition has been issued by a keen scholar already widely experienced in this field.

This play, the only manuscript of which is in the library at Karlsruhe (and this a copy of the lost original), was first edited by F. J. Mone (1846). Richard Froning in an improved edition presented it in *Kurschner's Deutsche Nationalliteratur* (1892); this is still the most accessible text, since the play was unfortunately not included in Reclam's *Deutsche Literatur in Entwicklungsreihen*. C. Schroder's edition (1893) superseded Froning's work and remained standard for decades up to the present, when this term must clearly be conceded to Krogmann's competent volume.

Practically all of the obscurities hitherto remaining in the text are convincingly cleared up in the introduction, footnotes, and glossary. In addition to this apparatus Krogmann uses the sensible device of indicating on two pages the periodical literature regarding each disputed line, the condensation shown here is admirable but a listing of the journals for which abbreviations are used would probably save time for most readers. To treat of details is beyond the scope of this review except to mention Krogmann's most striking correction of the copyist of 1464: internal evidence shows definitely that the *tabernator* was originally a *tabernatrix*, a female rôle in the second part balancing that of Eve in the first.

It is a pleasure to find that Krogmann reveals as such a stupidity that has been finding its way into numerous standard works. Schroder, having noted in a Wismar document that in 1465 a certain Peter Kalff was *magister curiae* at Redentin, conjectured that this man could have been the author, since it is highly improbable that this monk was alone in the monastery, Stämmler

takes much for granted when he includes in his *Verfasserlexikon* for medieval literature an article "Peter Kalff"¹ Krogmann shows that it cannot even be established that Kalff made the extant copy, while numerous slips prove that this copy was definitely not done by the original author. In view of the fact that we know nothing whatsoever about the monk Peter Kalff except that he "flourished" around 1465, it is certainly worse than useless for Arnold's widely used *Das Deutsche Drama* (1925) to list in the author index this bovine name!

University of Maryland

A. E. ZUCKER

BRIEF MENTION

Forbidden Fruit & Other Plays. By DION BOUCICAULT. Edited by ALLARDYCE NICOLL and F. THEODORE CLOAK. *False Shame and Thirty Years, Two Plays.* By WILLIAM DUNLAP. Edited by ORAL SUMNER COAD. *Glaucus & Other Plays.* By GEORGE HENRY BOKER. Edited, with introduction and notes, by SCULLEY BRADLEY. *Davy Crockett & Other Plays.* By LEONARD GROVER, FRANK MURDOCH, LESTER WALLACK, G. H. JESSOP, and J. J. McCLOSKEY. Edited by ISAAC GOLDBERG and HUBERT HEFFNER. *Trial without Jury & Other Plays.* By JOHN HOWARD PAYNE. Edited by CODMAN HISLOP and W. R. RICHARDSON. *The Last Duel in Spain & Other Plays.* By JOHN HOWARD PAYNE. Edited by CODMAN HISLOP and W. R. RICHARDSON. *The Early Plays of James A. Herne, with Act IV of Griffith Davenport.* Edited by ARTHUR HOBSON QUINN. *America's Lost Plays*, edited by Barrett H. Clark, vols. I-VII. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940. Pp. x + 318, xiv + 114, xiv + 230, xxvi + 234, xviii + 270, viii + 268, x + 164. \$5.00 a volume; \$85.00 the set of twenty volumes. By "lost" Mr. Clark means unpublished, though we are not to take him literally in every case. Five hundred dramas have been collected, and he is bringing out a hundred of them. It is not asserted that they are masterpieces of art; the immediate objects are to extend our knowledge of certain well-known writers, to set forth a number of plays of great popularity in their time, and to exhibit some "curious and illuminating criteria of public taste . . . from the Revolution down almost to the present day." The editing is slight; except for Professor Coad's list of Dunlap's plays, Professor Bradley's textual notes, and Professor Quinn's one-page bibliography, its appearance is confined to brief factual introductions. These are interesting, for the most part, and reserved in their

claims, save for what seems to this reviewer an excess of generosity in the estimate of Boker and overpraise for an adapted farce by Payne. It is in the gift of the texts themselves that the value of this commendable enterprise mainly resides, it will constitute, when completed, a huge essay in Americana. No doubt little theaters will shortly break out in a rash of revivals. I hope they will play them straight. The actor may be unable to make the blood of an audience run either cold or hot when one of Herne's villains thus apostrophizes himself:

The fortune of a monarch would not content you without her Your passionate love for her burns in your veins and swells your heart till you pant and thirst like the tracking bloodhound, and, like him, you will not be balked of your prey

But there is now and again a richly racy line in a character part; and there are occasional outpourings of patriotic sentiment which, if more than a trifle florid in style, are in matter so soundly American and either so applicable to our own times or so reminiscent of the confident vision of better ones that an amateur entrusted with them might find himself recapturing the experience of those palmy days when an actor could go home and tell his wife, "Tonight the pit rose at me!" Certainly it is the melodramas that constitute by far the most vital pieces in these seven volumes.

H. S.

Tom Taylor and the Victorian Drama. By WINTON TOLLES. Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, no. 148. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940. Pp. x + 302. \$3.50. Examining the plays of Tom Taylor, who in "thirty-four years of prolific writing . . . experimented with almost every phase of Victorian drama" and had at least one piece produced by every important London management except one, this monograph helps explain why the English theater by 1880 was ready for a realistic and literary drama, as it was not ready in 1844 when the future art critic of the *Times* and editor of *Punch* wrote his first farce. It was a backward theater still, but Henry Arthur Jones could say in 1882 that "there was life in it"; and Mr. Tolles, who is fully aware of his author's limitations, points out that "the life had been put there by a generation of playwrights among whom Tom Taylor was prominent." His work "illustrates the tendencies, the strength, and the weakness of early Victorian drama"; more than that, it reflects some important changes in Victorian ideas and tastes outside the theatrical microcosm. Mr. Tolles has not chosen an exciting subject, and he rightly sticks close to the plays instead of trying to work up a biography; but, for all that, he contrives to keep his book interesting, and any stu-

dent of English drama will find plenty of things worth knowing in it. There is a careful bibliography, owners of Professor Allardyce Nicoll's *Early Nineteenth Century Drama* should make a point of amending his invaluable handlist in the light of Mr. Tolles's discussion (p. 64, n. 1) of the not unnatural confusion between the two Taylors, our Tom and one Thomas P. On the other hand, Mr. Tolles eris in crediting Phelps with the production of all but four of Shakespeare's plays. the exceptions were seven, an inconsiderable number, as Mrs. Herne would say. Occasionally, as here, there has been too trustful reliance on a secondary source. Another blemish is the irritating practice of giving only an author's surname in a reference footnote. A good deal of space is necessarily abandoned to the summarizing of plots; but there is ample and amusing quotation, and Mr. Tolles's commentary is acute. The index is excellent.

H. S.

Romanticism in America: Papers Contributed to a Symposium Held at the Baltimore Museum of Art May 13, 14, 15, 1940. Edited by GEORGE BOAS. Baltimore The Johns Hopkins Press, 1940. Pp xi + 202, 15 plates \$2.25. The intent, and in some respects the performance, of this little volume are so excellent as to outweigh serious defects of execution on the part of the contributors and of control on the part of the editor. In brief, the nine papers touch upon the "romantic" aspects of American politics, painting, feminism (in life and in literature), house furnishings, architecture, music, and philosophy. In general the "time area" is the first half of the nineteenth century. Most of the evidence is drawn from the Atlantic seaboard. This is, I think, the first time that a specific phase of American cultural development has been subjected to simultaneous analysis by experts in the various arts and in social history. The great merit of the performance is that the essays really do bear upon the central theme. That central theme, the nature of the American approach to romanticism, is suggestively treated in the little preface by the general editor, which is so good as to lead one to wish that it had been made a longer and more integral part of the symposium.

The discussion of Thomas Cole's landscapes by Walter L. Nathan is both refreshing and aesthetically courageous; the essay on "The Romantic Lady" by Ralph P. Boas is, if on a less difficult subject, amusing, and Roger Gilman's treatise on the "romantic interior" performs a real service by unearthing forgotten examples of aesthetical romanticism. Unfortunately the essay on romantic musicians in the United States, rather unhappily entitled "The Beethovens of America," is smothered by its own erudition, and, in view of the special place given to music by transcendental theory and by Poe, misses the point of the whole symposium.

"Early American Gothic" is competently discussed by Agnes Addison. The classical revival of the late twenties and the thirties, an important part of romantic Hellenism both in this country and abroad, is, however, only touched upon. The final essay, "Romantic Philosophy in America," by George Boas is too slight for the importance of the subject. One would gladly sacrifice several pages of musical minutiae from the preceding essay for a more extended treatment of transcendentalism.

HOWARD MUMFORD JONES

Harvard University

The New Oxford Book of English Verse. Chosen and edited by SIR ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH. Oxford: the Clarendon Press, 1939. Pp. xxviii + 1172. \$3.00. The revised edition of *The Oxford Book of English Verse* is disappointing. The editor states that he has "risked repairing the old structure with a stone here, a tile there, and hope[s] to have left it as weather-proof as when it was first built." In general, his metaphor is just. There has been no drastic change in the architecture, it is unmistakably Victorian. This is not to attempt to damn the book with a glib epithet. To be more explicit: since the Oxford Book first appeared, some forty years ago, there have occurred a profound change in our conception of poetry and a profound change in taste. The editor has been conscious of this critical shift, as his preface indicates; and his additions to the seventeenth-century section show that he has tried to respond to it. But the shift has been noticed rather than assimilated. As a consequence, the new edition is left stranded, a period piece rather than a contemporary document.

The difficulty is not that the book is insufficiently "topical" and "up-to-date." The defect goes deeper. The whole last third of the book is filled with poems which one might expect a Victorian to have admired, but on which our second thoughts ought to count for something. How can one justify, in a treasury of English poetry, the inclusion of such poems as those chosen from poetasters like May Probyn, Sir Gilbert Parker, Henry Cust, Eden Phillpotts, Norman Gale, and many another? Time has surely given us some perspective here. After all, is that high-school favorite, "Thanatopsis," a gem of English literature? Is not "The Bells of Shandon" positively bad—by any possible standard? How can one justify giving Emily Dickinson only eight lines and seven pages to Christina Rossetti? Such inclusions and omissions drastically limit the volume's value as a collection of "the best" English verse.

CLEANTH BROOKS

Louisiana State University

Edmund Burke and His Literary Friends By DONALD CROSS BRYANT. St. Louis, Missouri: 1939. Pp. xii + 323. \$2.75. (Washington University Studies, New Series, Language and Literature, No. 9) "Without any considerable pretensions to literature myself, I have aspired to the love of letters." Thus wrote Burke in 1796, Professor Bryant's monograph gives to this remark elaborate and systematic support. Biographies of Burke have naturally concentrated on his political career, giving only incidental notice to his literary interests. In the present study we have separate chapters devoted to Burke's relations with Johnson, Reynolds, Goldsmith, Boswell, Garrick, the Burneys, Crabbe, and numerous other less important figures. Some of Burke's literary opinions are thus seen in clearer setting, and the better side of his rich personality is attractively displayed. For in spite of his haranguing and his punning and his occasional bad taste—and sometimes in spite of his politics—Burke's many literary friends liked as well as respected him. Many of the materials employed in this study have long been familiar, in widely scattered sources, but the facts are now made more useful by convenient arrangement. In addition, full advantage has been taken of the recently published Boswell Papers, Professor Wecter's studies of Burke's personal affairs, and Dr. Copeland's investigation of the *Annual Register*. The organization of the monograph, though serviceable, has perhaps minimized the analysis of Burke's opinions and tastes. His relation to the various strains of romanticism, for instance, remains ill-defined, and little light is thrown upon the development of his aesthetic theories after the publication of the *Essay on the Sublime*.

B. R. MCELDERRY, JR.

The State College of Washington

Ten Victorian Poets. By F. L. LUCAS. Cambridge: University Press, 1940. Pp. xx + 199. \$2.50. The first edition of this work appeared as *Eight Victorian Poets* in 1930. There are now added essays on William Morris and Christina Rossetti. This reviewer, familiar with the first edition, believes the new form well deserved. Originally delivered for the British Broadcasting Corporation the sketches are pleasantly informal but not lacking in discrimination and penetration. At times the judgment appears somewhat arbitrarily eclectic. Browning is "extremely vital," yet "also a little vulgar—with the assertiveness of the self-made man, who thinks to brazen out lack of breeding by lack of manners." Tennyson's appraisal is higher. Arnold though "a typical Victorian, a poet struggling with a preacher," is "less tiresome in his pulpit" than either. Yet "what a Philistine this scourge of the Philistines

himself always remained." Patmore, "combination of Catholic mystic and Colonel Blimp," provides some amusing entertainment. Adverse criticism is, however, more than balanced by praise. Particularly good is the estimate of Swinburne, with emphasis on his merits and defects as those of youth, while the other Pre-Raphaelites, as well as Clough and Hardy, receive acute yet sympathetic attention.

This little volume is important testimony to the fact that the Victorians are now regarded as "neither children nor gods, but men in a world of men."—And sometimes very great men.

L. WARDLAW MILES

The Johns Hopkins University

Die Syntax des Komparativs im Gotischen, Althochdeutschen, und Altsächsischen Von EDMUND BALDAUF Dachau, 1938. S. 53, M. 3. All but nine of these pages are given over to a chrestomathy of cases, with only such interspersed reading matter, infestive at that, as seems necessary to explain the citations. Baldauf refutes Behaghel, J. Grimm, Hench, Blatz, Wilmanns, Delbruck, and Brugmann—as a hopeful candidate can always do when he makes a detailed study of a point that was minor in works of general scope. He explains the non-existence of certain adjectives in the positive by contending that primitive man could not grasp such an absolute concept as "gut" until culture had touched him. Did the Latin shun "bonior" and "bonissimus" for aesthetic reasons? Grammarians preserve but they do not create. Is it true that the absolute comparative was introduced into New High German by Klopstock? Under comparative dative, Baldauf lists a small catalogue of cases from Gothic alone. One of these is accredited to Skeireins 3, 24 (Streitberg ed.) *Iþ sa afar mis gagganda swinþoza mis 1st*. Correct; but this occurs in Mark I, 7 and Luke III, 16, and is only a quotation in the Skeireins.

There are evidences of excessive enthusiasm. *Frumei* for *frumists* is explained. "Es gibt nur zwei Briefe in Tim. . . ." The discussion of Gothic *alja*, as either conjunction or preposition, also of "ehe" (cf. *ehedem*) and "seit" (cf. *seitdem*) is rewarding. Some of the translations are misleading. "Als dass ich nicht gehe" for *Unte jabai ik ni galeiþa*. Nor is this passage in John vi. 17

A. W. PORTERFIELD

New York City

Arthurian Romance and Modern Poetry and Music. By WILLIAM A. NITZE. Chicago University of Chicago Press, 1940. The natural magic of the Celt, to borrow Matthew Arnold's phrase, is in this book. The author enthralls the reader's attention although not by extravagant hypotheses, for the main course of his thought keeps to the pretty safe theme that the natural magic of the Arthurian romances came to them through Welsh and Breton bards from Irish originals. The book supplies a background for Tennyson's *Idylls of the King*, and Wagner's operas, *Tristan and Parsifal*. For an ancient Irishman, a fairy or a giant lurked behind every bush, and the world of spirit was as real as the world of matter, natural magic was at home in Ireland. The high spots of the book are two places, where the author quotes from ancient Irish stories which are old favorites of mine. The first is the story of how the wounded Prince Fraech was carried by gayly dressed Irish fairies into their fairy mound to be healed, almost as King Arthur was borne to Avalon. The second is the story of three horsemen with red faces, red hair, and red everything, who rode before the wondering King Conaire, and revealed to him that they were demons of the dead. The author is a learned man to whom all the literatures of Europe are an open book, and he has here set down some pages that are of extraordinary interest to anybody who cares for poetry.

ARTHUR C. L. BROWN

Northwestern University

Louisiana French Folk Songs. By IRÈNE THÉRÈSE WHITFIELD. Louisiana State University Press, 1939. \$3.00. The author has grouped the results of her researches according to the language of the various songs: Louisiana French, which approximates standard French, Acadian French, and Negro French. The Louisiana French songs are well-known favorites from France plus French versions of *Billy Boy* and *The Butcher Boy*. The Acadian dialect folk songs are more native to the region. English creeps in in the word *blues* in titles of songs, *Fido* (English pronunciation), *bozo*, *hobo*, *byebye*. They include several adaptations of American songs. Even more colorful are the negro French songs with their quaint words and phraseology. Here also, there are passing English influences—the mention of *soy beans*, *Grecian band* (which should be *Grecian bend*), etc. In *Cribisse' Cribisse'*, a negro version of an English song, we find *show*, *gone*, *hole*, *six mule team*. In *Une "game" chaou*, negro version of *I got mine*, popular about 1900, the use of *chaou*, dialect form for *raccoon* to translate *coon* meaning negro is amusing. The author has included the music for these songs and translations of the negro ones. In this connection,

Juste garder li means *seulement la regarder*, not *garder*. In *Prêez-moñ to cab, quand ma tchué mo boeuf, ma donne toi la peau, cab'* is *câble*, but the word is used to mean any kind of a rope. It may mean *lasso* as western Louisiana shades into Texas and forms part of the fringe of the great cattle raising west. "If you lend me your lasso, I'll give you the hide when I kill my steer!" She has also included a list of Louisiana French songs available on phonograph records. The book is a work of great merit, showing much patient research. It preserves for posterity an interesting manifestation of French influence in the United States.

JAY K. DITCHY

Tulane University

French Chivalry. Chivalric Ideas and Practices in Medieval France. By SIDNEY PAINTER. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1940. \$2.00. Studies twice the length of Professor Painter's *French Chivalry* are frequently half as good. The author devotes 179 pages to this comprehensive subject and succeeds in producing a highly readable, stimulating, and informative volume. The book is divided into five chapters as follows: I, The Nobles of France; II, Feudal Chivalry; III, Religious Chivalry; IV, Courtly Love; V, Criticisms and Compromises. Though the author modestly makes no great claim to originality, the mere fact that he succeeds admirably in making a clear synthesis of a subject whose ramifications are vast is perhaps the best indication of the importance of his achievement. Students of medieval literature could profit considerably by a perusal of this volume, the fourth chapter in particular being a helpful discussion of a topic of considerable interest. The volume is well indexed, a selective bibliography would have greatly enhanced its value.

THOMAS A. KIRBY

Louisiana State University

Burtonian Melancholy in the Plays of John Ford. By S. BLAINE EWING. Princeton Studies in English, no. 19. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940. Pp. x + 126. \$1.50. Professor Ewing begins this welcome study with a twenty-one page summary of the *Anatomy*, followed by eight pages on the chronology of the ten dramas directly concerned with the theme. The body of his monograph deals, play by play, with Ford's use of Burtonian materials. Finally, twenty-four pages are devoted to an analysis of the significance, particularly for the dramatist's thought and technique, of his preoccupation with melancholy. This is not a biographical essay; but Mr. Ewing, accepting Mr. L. C. Knights's

explanation that Ford, like many of his contemporaries, was troubled by an increasing interest in psychology, an intensification of consciousness of Death's imminence, and a sense of frustration inspired by social and economic changes, plausibly suggests that he was very likely a melancholiac himself. A number of his characters are placed in a stronger light than the dramatist's own methods leave them in for the reader unacquainted with Burton. Bassanes, in *The Broken Heart*, is the jealous melancholiac, and his eventual adoption of the right remedy, patience, is not an inconsistent piece of characterization but in line with the best authority Giovanni, in *'Tis Pity*, exemplifies the religious melancholiac "the triumph of atheism is the seal of his melancholy." A bibliography is included, but an index is wanting.

H. S.

Letters of Nicholas Vachel Lindsay to A. Joseph Armstrong
 Edited by A. JOSEPH ARMSTRONG. Baylor Bulletin, vol. XIII, no. 3. Baylor University Waco, 1940. Pp xiv + 122. A careful selection of Lindsay letters, enlisting the cooperation of numerous correspondents, might provide, according to the compiler's choice, a sketchbook of American oddities, a record of the growth of a poet's mind, or the plot of an American tragedy. As host and friend, for several years Professor Armstrong booked the lecture tours. The three subjects are by no means remote from Lindsay's anguished and reluctant search for a livelihood to be directly derived from understanding audiences, but this particular sheaf is pretty slender to stand alone. There are, however, some very characteristic things in it.

H. S.

CORRESPONDENCE

URFAUST Line 308 In the February number of *MLN* (LVI, 90-94) Professor Walz has discussed the meaning of the verse "Wer erst von Geists Erweitung sprach" and in the writer's opinion made possible the correct interpretation. The detailed discussion of the words *Wer* and *sprach* was necessary in view of the statement made by Stuart Atkins in *MLN*, LV that all difficulties are removed if we read 'War' erst von Geistserweitung Sprach. Walz has shown that the form *Wer* for *War* does not occur in Goethe and the obvious conclusion is that *Wer* must be construed as a pronoun. Likewise he has proved that *sprach* must be taken as a verb because there is no clear case of a noun written with a small letter in Goethe's works apart from several instances in his Leipzig

letters What Walz says, however, about the idiom 'von etwas ist die Sprache' and the more common synonymous idiom 'von etwas ist die Rede' is not so convincing Both Goethe and Schiller use the second expression without the definite article The former writes in a letter "dass in solchen Fällen eigentlich von Anerkennung eines Rechtes, nicht von dem Äquivalent einer Arbeit Rede sei" (Fischer, *Goethe-Wortschatz*, p 495) In Fiesco 2, 5 Schiller has "Vielleicht weil sie saure Gesichter schneiden, die Achsel zucken, wenn von Staatssachen Rede wird" (*DWb* VIII, 456) There is no reason why the synonym *Sprache* could not have been similarly used for the nonce to rhyme with *nach*

Open to objection is also the interpretation of *Wer* as a mere indefinite relative pronoun introducing a conditional clause. *Wer* in Modern German is a compound relative even though it may have hypothetical meaning This is clearly brought out in the examples quoted by Walz, as for example "Rein und eiquickend stromt Wahrheit, wer sie vom Quell schopft," 1 e Wer die Wahrheit vom Quell schopft, für den stromt sie rein und erquickend "Freiheit' ein schönes Wort, wer's recht verstunde," 1 e Wer die Freiheit recht verstunde, für den ist(ware) sie ein schönes Wort When we apply this interpretation to verses 307-08 of the *Urfaust*

Mich dunkt das gab sich alle nach,
Wer erst von Geists Erweitung sprach'

we get: "Wer erst von Geists Erweitung sprach (1 e. gesprochen hat), für den, dunkt mich, gab sich das alle nach," 1 e Who (If a person) has first discussed (and settled) the question of spiritual expansion (1 e. has decided the matter of academic pursuits), for him, I think, all this (matter of physical needs) would afterwards easily take care of itself, a respectful and withal, as Walz rightly says, slightly critical reply *Wer* must necessarily refer to the student and not the professor The above explanation does not require the assumption that *sprach* stands for *sprache*.

EDWARD H. SEHRT

George Washington University

SOME UNPUBLISHED VERSES BY THOMAS RANDOLPH My attention has been called to a previous publication of these verses by Professor Cyrus L. Day in *RES*, VIII (1932), 29-36 I regret having unwittingly ignored Professor Day's priority, and am glad to acknowledge it here.

RHODES DUNLAP

State University of Iowa

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received]

Anderson, Sherwood, Wilder, Thornton, Sessions, Roger, and Lescage, William.—The intent of the artist Edited with an introduction, by Augusto Centeno *Princeton, N J* Princeton U Press, 1941 Pp vi + 162 \$2 50

Beach, Joseph Warren.—American fiction, 1920-1940 *New York* Macmillan, 1941 Pp x + 371 \$2 50 and \$1 90

Bird, Robert Montgomery.—*The Cowled Lover*, and other plays Edited by Edward H O'Neill *Princeton, N J* Princeton U Press, 1941 Pp x + 221 \$5 00 (America's Lost Plays, xii)

Bradbrook, M C and Thomas, M G. Lloyd.—Andrew Marvell *Cambridge* University Press [New York Macmillan], 1940 Pp viii + 161 \$2 25

Brockway, Philip Judd.—Sylvester Judd (1813-1853), novelist of transcendentalism *Orono, Maine* University Press, 1941 Pp xiv + 121 (Maine Bulletin, xliii, 12, U of Me Studies, second series, 53)

Bryan, W. F. and Dempster, Germaine (eds.).—Sources and analogues of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* *Chicago, Ill* : U of Chicago Press, [1941] Pp xvi + 765 \$10 00 [A collaborative undertaking by members of the Chaucer Group of the MLA, twenty-one contributors]

Buchmann, Ralf.—Martin F Tupper and the Victorian middle class mind *Bern* A Francke, 1941 Pp 165 Fr 9 50 (Swiss Studies in English, 10)

Charleston, Britta Marian.—Studies on the syntax of the English verb *Bern* A Francke, 1941 Pp x + 209 Fr 11 (Swiss Studies in English, 11)

Clifford, James L.—Hester Lynch Piozzi (Mrs Thrale) *Oxford* Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford U Press], 1941 Pp xx + 492 \$6 50

Emery, Don W. and Kierzek, John M.—English fundamentals Form A, revised edition *New York* Macmillan, 1941 Pp vi + 234

English Association.—Essays and studies, XXV, 1939 Collected by Percy Simpson *Oxford* Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford U. Press], 1940 Pp. 115 \$2 50

Green, Z. E.—Writing in business, a text in business English. *New York*: Holt, [1941]. Pp xxii + 502. \$2.80

Gregory, George MacK. and Jordan, Archi-

bald C.—Fundamentals of college composition, a scientifically tested approach *New York* Holt, [1941] Pp viii + 554 \$2 20

Kreider, Paul V.—Repetition in Shakespeare's plays *Princeton, N J* Princeton U Press, 1941 Pp xii + 306 \$3 50

Lewis, B. Roland.—The Shakespeare documents, facsimiles, transliterations, translations, and commentary 2 vols *Stanford University, Calif* Stanford U Press, 1941. Pp xxiv + 324, xi + 307 \$35 00

MacKaye, Steele.—*An Ariant Knave*, and other plays Edited, with introduction, by Percy MacKaye *Princeton, N J* Princeton U Press, 1941 Pp xviii + 234 \$5 00 (America's Lost Plays, xi)

Marchand, Leshe A.—The Athenaeum, a mirror of Victorian culture *Chapel Hill, North Carolina* U of N C Press, 1941 Pp xvi + 411 \$3 50

Mersand, Joseph.—The American drama, 1930-1940, essays on playwrights and plays *New York* Modern Chapbooks, 1941 Pp 184 \$2 00

—The play's the thing, enjoying the plays of today *New York* Modern Chapbooks, 1941 Pp iv + 101 \$2 00

Phillips, William John.—France on Byron. Diss *Philadelphia, Pa* U of Pa., 1941. Pp 81

Ratchford, Fannie Elizabeth.—The Brontës' web of childhood *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1941 Pp xx + 293 \$3 50

Sloane, Eugene Hulse.—Robert Gould, seventeenth century satirist Diss *Philadelphia, Pa* : U. of Pa, 1940 Pp iv + 126.

Tuell, Anne Kimball.—John Sterling, a representative Victorian *New York*: Macmillan, 1941 Pp xvi + 405 \$3.50

Turner, Arlin.—Hawthorne as editor, selections from his writings in *The American magazine of useful and entertaining knowledge* *University, Louisiana* La State U Press, 1941 Pp viii + 290 \$3 00 (La. State U Studies, 42)

University of Texas Publication, 4026—Studies in English, 1940 *Austin, Texas*. U of Texas, 1940 Pp 175 \$1 00

Webb, Richard and Coulson, Edwin R.—Sidney Lanier, poet and prosodist *Athens, Georgia*: U of Ga Press, 1941 Pp xviii + 108 \$2 00

White, Newman Ivey.—Shelley. *New York*: Knopf, 1940 Pp xvi + 748, x + 642 + cxliii \$12 50

GERMAN

Abl, Alma.—Wilhelm Niemeyer Eine Darstellung seines dichterischen Werkes. Diss *Hamburg* Christians, 1940 xv, 120 pp M 7

Ackermann, Otto — Germanische Gefolgschaftshaltung in der Heldendichtung des Mittelalters [Junge Wissenschaft im Osten H 3] *Breslau*: Priebsch, 1940 70 pp M 2 50

Arndt, Ingeborg — Die seelische Welt im Roman des 18. Jahrhunderts Diss Gießen. *Tubingen*: Bolzle, 1940 83 pp

Baesecke, Georg — Die Indogermanische Verwandtschaft des Hildebrandheds [Nachrichten von d Ges d Wiss zu Göttingen. Philol-hist Kl Fachgr 4, N F Bd 3, Nr 5]. *Göttingen*: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1940 Pp 139-153. M 1

Berger, Kurt — Menschenbild und Heldenmythos in der Dichtung des deutschen Idealismus *Berlin*: Junker u Dunnhaupt, 1940 303 pp M 10

Boll, Karl — Die Weltanschauung Theodor Storms [Neue deutsche Forschungen Abt Neuere deutsche Literaturgesch Bd 26]. *Berlin*: Junker & Dunnhaupt, 1940 184 pp M 8

Buchner, Max — Friedrich Wilhelm Weber Leben und Werk des Dreizehnhunddichter [Grosse Mannergestalten] *Dulmen*: Laumann [1940] 400 pp M 5 80

Buld, Heinrich — Volk und Sprache im nordlichen Westfalen Westfälische Ortschaften im Spiegel ihrer Sprache Diss *Münster*: Aschendorff [1939] 309 pp M 5

Casper, Siegfried — Hanns Johst *München*: Albert Langen, 1940 122 pp M 3

Chronik des Wiener Goethe-Vereins Im Auftrag des Vorsitzers des Wiener Goethe-Vereins hrsg von Eduard Castle Bd. 45 *Wien*: Wiener Goethe-Verein, 1940 40 pp, 7 plates, 4°

Dell, Margret — Adalbert Stifter als bildender Künstler. Diss Frankfurt *Wurzburg*: K J Triltsch, 1939 77 pp

Derwein, Herbert — Die Flurnamen von Heidelberg Strassen, Plätze, Feld, Wald Eine Stadtgeschichte Mit 17 Abbildungen u 5 Karten [Badische Flurnamen Bd 2, H 5] *Heidelberg*: Carl Winter, 1940 293 pp M 10

Eidam, Helmut — Goethes "Iphigenie" im deutschen Urteil. Diss Frankfurt *Wurzburg*: Triltsch, 1940 ix, 85 pp. M 3

Ennemoser, Maria — Goethes magische Balladen Versuch einer Auslegung Diss *Münster*: Bochum-Langendreer. Poppinghaus, 1939 100 pp

Fontane, Theodor, und Bernhard von Lepel Ein Freundschaftsbriefwechsel. Hrsg von Julius Petersen Bd. 1. 2. *München*: C H Beck, 1940 I: 460 pp, 5 plates. II: 475 pp, 5 plates M 13.50.

Frenssen, Gustav — Lebensbericht. *Berlin*: Grote, 1940 352 pp, 24 plates. M. 5.50.

Frenzel, Elisabeth — Die Gestalt des Juden auf der neueren deutschen Bühne Diss *Berlin* *Buhl-Baden* Koncordia [1940]. 285 pp

Gabler, Karl — Richard Wagners Ringdichtung als deutsches Erleben *Berlin*: Th Fritsch [1940] 128 pp M 2

Gaupp, Walter — Sturmische Fahrt [Oxford Rapid-reading German Texts, Series C] *New York* *Oxford* Univ Press, 1941 46 pp \$0 30

Gedenkschrift zum 75. Geburtstage von Meinrad Lienert (1865-1933), dem Gestalter und Bereicherer der Mundart, dem Schilderer der Heimat, dem Meister des Liedes Hrsg von Dr G Schmid und Emmy Rogivue-Waser *Oberdiessbach (Bern)* Schwyzerlüt-Verl [1940] 126 pp Fr. 3

Goethe-Kalender Herausgegeben vom Frankfurter Goethe-Museum (Jg 34) 1941 *Leipzig*. Dieterich [1940] viii, 292 pp M 5

Gotthelf, Jeremias — Mir wei es uf Lutzel fuh Briefwechsel mit Amtsrichter Burkhalter. *Zürich, Leipzig* Albert Zust [1940] 180 pp Fr 6 80

Gottschalk, Hanns — Strachwitz und die Entwicklung der heldischen Ballade Diss *Breslau* *Wurzburg*: Triltsch, 1940 95 pp M 2 70

[Grothe, Heinz] — August Hinrichs zum 60. Geburtstag am 18. April 1939 Stimmen der Freunde *Leipzig* Quelle & Meyer, 1939 59 pp

Grundmann, K — Die Entdeckung des "Biedermeier" in der Literatur [Aus Neo filologia, 1935, No 4] *Warschau* 1936 23 pp

Heusler, Andreas, zum Gedenken [Freiburger Universitätsreden H 33] *Freiburg* Wagner'sche Univ Buchhandlung, 1940 16 pp. 80 Pf

Hoffmann, Heinrich — Goethes Religion. *Bern*: Haupt, 1940 31 pp Fr 1 20

Hohenstein, Lili — Schiller, der Kampfer, der Dichter *Berlin* Neff [1940] 416 pp, 8 plates M 4 20.

Holm, Korfiz — Farbiger Abglanz Erinnerungen an Ludwig Thoma, Max Daubenhay und Albert Langen [Die kleine Bucherei 113] *München*: Albert Langen, 1940 61 pp 80 Pf

Johannsen, Albrecht — Vom nordfriesischen Wörterbuch. [Flensburg]: 1939 16 pp

Kahn, Ludwig — Some sociological aspects of literature [Reprint from *The Modern Language Journal*, Vol. XXV, 1941] Pp 460-466

— Fortschrittsglaube und Kulturkritik im bürgerlichen Roman: Gustav Freytag und Wilhelm Raabe [Reprinted from *Corona*]. *Durham, N C.* Duke Univ Press, 1941. Pp 252-267

Kindermann, Heinz—Ferdinand Raimund Lebenswerk und Wirkungsraum eines deutschen Volksdramatikers (1-3 Tsd.) *Wien, Leipzig* Luser, 1940 521 pp, 26 plates M 8 50

Kleitsch, Franz—Der "Phantassus" von Arno Holz Diss Berlin [Stadion Bd 6]. *Würzburg*: Triltsch, 1940 86 pp. M 3 60.

Koch, Franz—Welt und Ich, das Grundproblem von Hebbels Theorie des Dramas [Aus Abhandl d Preuss Akad d Wiss. Phil-hist Kl Jg 1940, Nr 4] *Berlin*: de Gruyter, 1940 17 pp 4°. M. 1

Konopatzki, Hans—Das Bild der Antike bei Paul Ernst Diss Frankfurt *Würzburg*: K Triltsch, 1940 99 pp

Kuhn, Julius—Die Kunst Adalbert Stifters [Neue dt Forschungen Abt Neuere dt. Literaturgesch Bd 28] *Berlin*: Junker u Dunnhaupt, 1940 344 pp M 12

Langenbeck, Curt—Tragodie und Gegenwart Die Rede des Tragers des Rheinischen Literaturpreises *München*. Albert Langen, 1940 13 pp 60 Pf.

Lehmann, Robert—Plattdeutsche Pflanzennamen in den Vierlanden Diss *Hamburg*. [1939] 71 pp

Lugossy, Emma—Die Frage der Labiovelarreihe im Indogermanischen mit besonderer Rücksicht auf das Germanische Geleitwort von Prof Huss *Debrecen*. 1940 44 pp

Meuser, Johannes—Hebbels Anschauungen über die deutsche Literatur der nachklassischen Zeit Diss *Berlin* Pfau, 1940 407, vii pp

Migge, Walther—Studien zur Lebensgestaltung Clemens Brentanos [Neue deutsche Forschungen Abt Neuere deutsche Literaturgesch Bd 27] *Berlin*: Junker u Dunnhaupt, 1940 68 pp M. 3

Mueller, Eugen Hartmuth—Die Sprache Paul Flemings Untersuchung des Laut- und Formenstandes Diss Minnesota *Heidelberg*. Winter, 1938 xii, 114 pp

Müller, Ursula—Die Gestalt Lucifers in der Dichtung vom Barock bis zur Romantik Diss Giessen [Germanische Studien H 229] *Berlin* Ebering, 1940 89 pp M 3 90.

Oeftering, Hans-Gerhart—Naturgefühl und Naturgestaltung bei den alemannischen Dichtern von Beat L. Muralt bis Jeremias Gotthelf (Mit Erstdruck d. Hymnus "Ekstase" von Johann Peter Hebel) Diss Marburg [Germanische Studien H 226] *Berlin*. Ebering, 1940 176 pp M 6 90

Otto Ludwig-Jahrbuch Jahresgabe des Otto Ludwig-Vereins Hrsg von Wilhelm Greiner. Jg. 13, 1941 *Weimar*: Bohlau [1940]. 119 pp M. 2.

Pfannmüller, Walther—Der Nachlass

Peter Hilles Diss. Bonn. *Gotha*: 1940. 111 pp, 2 plates.

Ricke, Kurt—Zeit und Mensch bei Wilhelm Raabe Seine Stellung zu Problemen seines Jahrhunderts Diss *Hamburg* 1940. 130 pp

Ruttenauer, Isabella—"Ich wach zu Gott" Der Herr und die Schöpfung in Friedrich von Spees Gedichten [Zeugnis u. Auslegung] *Würzburg*: Werkbund-Verl. 1940 35 pp 75 Pf

Ruh, Kurt—Der Passionstraktat des Heinrich von St Gallen Diss Zurich *Thayngen*: Augustin, 1940 cv, 175 pp

Runge, Philipp Otto—Briefwechsel mit Goethe Hrsg v. Hellmuth von Maltzahn [Schriften der Goethe-Gesellschaft. Bd 51] *Weimar* Goethe-Ges 1940 119 pp

Schmadel, Elisabeth von—Der Roman bei Paul Ernst Diss *München* 1940 117 pp

Stracke, Thea—Goethe und das Problem der Selbsterziehung Diss *Köln*: Orthen, 1940 61 pp

Thomas, Irmgard—Poetische Wallfahrt zum Rhein Mit 19 zeitgenössischen Bildern *Bonn* Ferd Dummler, 1941 126 pp. M 2 90

Wolf, K. Lothar, u Troll, Wilhelm—Goethes morphologischer Auftrag Versuch einer naturwissenschaftlichen Morphologie Mit 16 Abbildungen im Text [Die Gestalt H 1] *Leipzig*: Akad Verlagsges 1940 71 pp M 2 80

Wuhr, Wilhelm—Jean Paul und die französische Emigration T. 1 [Aus Jean Paul Blätter 1940, H 2] *Bayreuth* Ellwanger, 1940 35 pp

Zschesche, Manfred—Hermann Lingg Eine Erscheinung des deutschen Spätklassizismus Mit bes Berücksichtigung seiner Dramen Diss *Breslau* Korn, 1940 195 pp

FRENCH AND PROVENÇAL

Allison, J. M S—Concerning the Education of a Prince [Introd. essay and translations of a letter by Diderot and four by the Princess of Nassau-Saarbrück]. *New Haven*: Yale U Press, 1941. 48 pp. \$2 50.

Canfield, A G., and Patterson, W. F.—French Poems *New York* Holt, 1941. xxxix + 660 pp \$2 00

Cornwell, Irene—Contemporary Fr Fiction *New York* Holt, 1940 xi + 415 + civ pp \$1 80

Dumas—Les Trois Mousquetaires, adapted and ed H R Kollwijn and A. Coleman *Boston*. Heath, 1941 viii + 273 pp. \$1 20.

Du Mont, F. M.—Introductory French. *New York*: Am Bk. Co., 1941. xiv + 471 pp. \$1 80.

Eddy, H M and Struble, M.—Écrivains. *Boston*. Heath, 1941 xii + 256 pp \$1 28

Feuillerat, A.—Baudelaire et la belle aux cheveux d'or *New Haven*: Yale U Press, 1941 99 pp \$2 00

Hill, R. T., and Bergin, T. G.—Anthology of the Provençal Troubadours *New Haven*: Yale U Press, 1941 xvi + 365 pp \$5 00

Kany, C. E. and Dondo, M.—Intermediate Fr Conversation *Boston*: Heath, 1941. iv + 60 pp \$0 32

Spitzer, Leo —Die Branche VIII des Roman de Renart *Florence* "Bibliopolis," 1940 22 pp

Valéry, Paul. —La Politique de l'esprit, notre souverain bien, éd Lucy Leveaux *Manchester, Eng.* Eds de l'univ de Manchester, 1941 47 pp

Whitmarsh and Jukes. —Advanced Fr Course *New York*: Longmans, 1940 xii + 381 pp \$2 00

ITALIAN

Bertoni, G.—L Ariosto *Milano*: Bietti, 1939 76 pp

Bonomo, D.—Studi sul Rinascimento *Bologna*: Cappelli, 1940 113 pp

Capasso, A.—Ricerche, distinzioni, discussioni. Saggi critici, Tomo I *Genova*: E. Degli Orfini, 1940 545 pp.

Cioffari, V., Van Horne, J. (eds).—Ghiuletta e Romeo e altre novelle (Graded Italian Readers, Book Three). Heath, 1914 49 pp.

Conti, G. (ed.).—Novelle inedite intorno a Bernabò Visconti *Firenze*: Fondazione Ginori Conti, 1940. 111 pp

Del Vita, A.—L'Aretino Le cause della sua potenza e della sua fortuna *Arezzo*. Ediz della Casa Vasari, 1939 161 pp.

Dulles, Avery.—Principes Concordiae Pico della Mirandola and the Scholastic Tradition. (The Harvard Phi Beta Kappa Prize Essay for 1940) *Cambridge*: Harvard Univ. Press, 1941 182 pp.

Eggenschwyler, R.—Saggio sullo stile di B Cellini. *Vercelli*: tip. Gallardi, 1940 106 pp

Fatini, G.—I Fioretti di San Francesco e le lettere di Santa Caterina. *Torino*: Paravia, 1939 142 pp

Goldoni, C.—Il campiello Con un saggio sull'arte del Goldoni e il commento di M. Dazzi. *Milano*: Mondadori, 1940. xlv + 110 pp

Palgen, R.—Dantes Stern Glaube. Beiträge zur Erklärung des Paradiso. Mit 3 Tafelabb. *Heidelberg*: C. Winter, 1940. 80 pp.

Preve, M.—Manzoni penalista. *Torino*: Soc ed Internazionale, 1940. xii + 205 pp.

Ricolfi, A.—Studi sui "fedeli d'amore." Vol II: Dal problema del gergo al crollo

d'un regno *Roma*. Albrighi, Segati, e C., 1940 xlvii + 187 pp

Salinari, G.—Studio sulla poesia di F Gaeta *Todi* tip. Tuderte, 1939 211 pp

Schneider, Fr.—Dante Eine Einführung in sein Leben u sein Werk 2, wesentlich vermehrte Auflage *Weimar* Bohlau, 1940 xi + 230 pp

SPANISH

Arjona, Doris K., Friedman, Rose L., and Carvahal, Esther P.—Spain and America *New York* Scott Foresman, 1940 476 + xxxiv pp \$1 41

Boggs, R. S.—Bibliography of Latin American Folklore *New York*: Wilson, 1940 x + 109 pp

Cuatro Comedias [Lope, Alarcón, Tirso, Calderón], ed J M. Hill and M M Harlan *New York*: Norton, 1941 viii + 699 pp. \$4 25

Gil Vicente—Poesías, ed Dámaso Alonso. *Mexico* Ed Séneca, 1940 85 pp

Iglesia, Ramón —Baraja de crónicas castellanas del siglo XIV. *Mexico*: Ed. Séneca, 1940 109 pp

—El victorial, crónica de D Pedro Niño *Ibid* 1940 212 pp

Keniston, H. —Reading Spanish *New York*: Holt, 1940. x + 193 + xlv pp \$1 25

Levy, Bernard.—Quince cuentos populares. *New York*: Cordon, 1939 xi + 178 pp \$1 25

Moore, J. A. —The *Romancero* in the Chronicle-Legend Plays of Lope de Vega U of Pa diss, 1940. 162 pp (Series in Romance, no. 30)

Ortega, Joaquín—The Compulsory Teaching of Spanish in the Grade Schools of New Mexico *Albuquerque*: U. of N. Mex Press, 1941 15 pp.

Read, J L.—The Mexican Historical Novel, 1828-1910 *New York*: Inst de las Españas, 1939. xiv + 337 pp

Samuels, D. G.—Enrique Gil y Carrasco. *New York*: Inst. de las Españas, 1939 249 pp.

Torre Revello, J.—El libro, la imprenta y el periodismo en América durante la dominación española *Buenos Aires*: Fac. de Filosofía y Letras, 1940. 269 + cccxxviii + 19 pp.

Tuchock, E. H.—Trocitos cómicos. *Boston*: Heath, 1941 xi + 211 pp. \$1 20

Turk, L. H.—Introduction to Spanish. *Boston*: Heath, 1941 xvi + 331 pp. \$1 72

Wilkins, L. A.—Quinto en España, a beginners' book *New York*: Holt, 1940. xxvi + 472 + xxxi pp. \$1.56.

—Quinto en América, a second book. *Ibid.*, 1940. vii + 591 + xlvii pp. \$1.72.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LXI

NOVEMBER, 1941

Number 7

QUELQUES ASPECTS DÉMOCRATIQUES DE LA PHILOSOPHIE DE MONTAIGNE

Rémy de Gourmont voyait dans le cours de l'histoire de nombreuses dissociations d'idées. Il semble que nous assistions à l'heure actuelle à un phénomène de cette sorte. En effet, plusieurs écrivains du vingtième siècle établissent une distinction entre deux idées que l'époque précédente associait étroitement, entre le libéralisme, qui se définit généralement comme un système politique, et la démocratie, ensemble de bienfaits pour le plus grand nombre qui, à première vue, semblerait découler naturellement de ce système.¹ Ce travail a pour but d'établir cette distinction que Montaigne, tout en n'étant pas libéral, tout en faisant résider l'autorité soit dans le prince soit dans une aristocratie, est démocrate. On trouve dans sa philosophie non le système mais l'esprit de la démocratie dans son triple aspect, social, culturel et économique, de sorte que l'on peut dire qu'une aristocratie imbue de l'esprit de Montaigne respecterait la personnalité du peuple et ne s'opposerait pas aux réformes en faveur de la majorité des citoyens. Cette philosophie créerait dans l'aristocratie un état d'esprit qui en rendrait l'existence possible et acceptable sous un régime général de démocratie. Ainsi se trouverait résolu le problème de l'aristocratie dans la démocratie et par là il convient, croyons-nous, de faire ressortir l'actualité de Montaigne. En effet, les exigences de l'époque contemporaine obligent souvent le public à remettre la décision dans les affaires

¹ Cf. "Liquidation du Dix-huitième siècle" dans *Occident*, no 1, vol. 1, mars 1940, par Bernard Fay, Ramon Fernandez fait vigoureusement ressortir comment les libéraux du 19ème siècle, s'ils admettaient l'évolution politique refusaient d'admettre l'évolution économique ou celle des classes, "Double France," *R Paris*, 1er sept 1939; enfin John Charpentier dit dans son *Voltaire*, 1938, p 275, "Il est libéral donc pas démocrate."

de l'état au chef et à ses collaborateurs, il importe d'autant plus que le public se préoccupe des vues générales du chef et de ses conseillers et se demande quelle peut-être raisonnablement l'attitude de l'aristocratie à son égard.

Le point de vue de Montaigne avant 1576 à l'égard du peuple est incertain et plutôt hostile, mais en 1576, se manifeste un changement parce que Montaigne attache plus d'importance à l'héroïsme, vertu qui se trouve dans toutes les classes, qu'à la prise de conscience de soi-même. Montaigne en 1576 ou avant estime que le peuple est cette partie de la nation qui ne sait pas ce qu'elle veut, qui ainsi ne sait pas ce qu'elle croit ou doit croire et qui est le jouet des fluctuations de son humeur. Le peuple, selon lui, accepte facilement le premier raisonnement entendu.² Il a de la commisération, ce qui est seulement l'effet de la facilité,³ mais il est cruel aussi parce qu'il a peur, tout en éprouvant le besoin de dominer.

Cette canaille du vulgaire s'aguerrit et se gendarme à s'ensanglanter jusques aux coudes, et deschiquter un corps à ses pieds, n'ayant ressentiment d'aultre vaillance comme les chiens couards, qui deschirent en la maison et mordent les peaux des bestes sauvages qu'ils n'ont osé attaquer aux champs⁴

Cependant un passage qu'il est difficile de dater contredit celui qui précède, ou du moins révèle de l'incertitude:

Considérant le pauvre mendiant à ma porte, souvent plus enjoué et plus sain que moy . . . ie me resouls ayseement de n'entrer en effroy de ce qu'un moindre que moy prend avecques telle patience, et ne veulx croire que la bassesse de l'entendement puisse plus que la vigueur ou que les effects du discours ne puissent arriver aux effects de l'accoustumance⁵

Le peuple est crédule, léger et cruel, semble croire l'écrivain, du fait qu'il ne prend pas conscience de lui-même. Son oubli de la mort

² Montaigne, *Essays*, édition de Pierre Villey, tome 1, livre I, chapitre xxvii, page 229, A, et t. 1, I, xviii, p. 92, A. Toutes les citations de Montaigne dans cet article se rapportent à cette édition. Les lettres majuscules A B C (d'après Villey, tome 1, page xii) correspondent aux éditions de 1580, 1588, 1595 mais surtout datent l'idée à l'exclusion des considérations de style. La date sera ajoutée lorsque l'éditeur dit quand la principale partie de l'article a été écrite.

³ T. 1, I, 1, p. 7, A.

⁴ T. 2, II, xxvii, p. 487, A.

⁵ T. 1, I, xxxix, p. 313. La composition par sentences en mosaïque porte l'éditeur à croire que le chapitre xxxix est de 1572.

serait grossier.⁶ Il l'impatiente aussi, car il "ne se sent point . . . ne se ruge point . . . laisse la plupart de ses facultés naturelles oysives."⁷ Cette hostilité envers le peuple est-elle foncière? Il faudrait pour répondre à cette question pouvoir dire quelle importance Montaigne attachait déjà en 1572 à la prise de conscience. L'écrivain, en un passage qui paraît être de 1576, se montre sceptique sur sa valeur puisque, selon lui, lorsqu'il s'agit de la force d'âme, "la philosophie, au bout de ses préceptes, nous renvoie aux exemples d'un athlète et d'un muletier."⁸ Les vues de Montaigne enfin viennent à paraître moins incertaines ou contradictoires si l'on observe que, selon lui, et sur ce point il ne variera pas, la force d'âme, plutôt que la prise de conscience, est caractéristique de l'aristocratie. La prise de conscience est d'une valeur incertaine comme nous venons de voir, ou bien elle est à ses yeux une valeur esthétique plutôt qu'une valeur morale et absolue. Il faut souligner l'importance des paroles qui suivent:

[La doctrine . . . tient rang entre les choses nécessaires à la vie, comme la gloire, la noblesse, la dignité] [ou pour le plus, comme la beauté, la richesse] [et telles autres qualitez qui y servent voirement mais de loing et un peu plus par fantaisie que par nature] ⁹

Le dernier fragment entre parenthèses semble déjà de la période sceptique de 1576 et le sens en est renforcé plus tard par l'addition, "comme la beauté." En plus de tout cela s'agit-il bien de moins fortunés, lorsque Montaigne dans les exemples précédents condamne le peuple? Deux passages ci-dessus qui paraissent de 1572 indiquent que oui dans une mesure seulement bien relative. Déjà l'aristocratie, selon Montaigne, déborde le cadre des classes; elle est surtout affaire d'individus. Il dit bien avec Plutarque "qu'il y a plus de distance de tel à tel homme qu'il n'y en a de tel homme à telle beste," cependant il s'agit non pas de la richesse ni du savoir mais, comme il a pris soin de dire, "de la suffisance de l'âme et qualitez internes."¹⁰ Alors, comme il fera plus tard, il insiste qu'il faut juger non par classes mais par individus et se demander quelle

⁶ T. 1, I, xx, p. 103, A, environ 1572.

⁷ T. 2, II, xii, p. 232, A, env. 1576 (Villey, p. 193)

⁸ T. 2, II, xii, p. 217, A

⁹ T. 2, II, xii, p. 212 Le premier fragment porte A, le second C, le troisième A

¹⁰ T. 1, I, xlii, p. 275, A. La composition en forme de mosaïque porte Villey à croire que le chapitre xlii date de 1572.

âme a un homme, si elle est "riche du sien" et brave, car "Si nous considérons un paysan et un roy, un noble et un vilain, un magistrat et un homme privé, un riche et un pauvre, il se présente soudain à nos yeux une extrême disparité, qui ne sont différents, par manière de dire qu'en leur chausses."¹¹

L'attitude de Montaigne autour de 1588, tout à la fin de sa vie, révèle surtout que ses sentiments sont devenus plus chaleureux à l'égard du peuple. D'autre part, son opinion que l'aristocratie dépasse le cadre des classes se précise. Les humbles, qui ne connaissent ni Aristote ni Caton et qui n'ont pas le souci d'affermir leur caractère sont naturellement énergiques. Son jardinier a peut-être enterré son père ou son fils ce matin et il travaille en ce moment comme si de rien n'était. Le peuple adoucit jusqu'au nom des maladies et, dans son langage, la phtisie devient la toux.¹² Il possède force d'âme, joie, enjouement et santé.¹³ Plus remarquable même, Montaigne voit les marchands, les juges de village, les artisans aller de pair avec la noblesse pour la vaillance et la science militaire.¹⁴ Puisqu'il est question de constance, de bravoure, de richesse d'âme, Montaigne croit que l'on se développe également où qu'on soit placé dans la société. "On attache aussi bien toute la philosophie à une vie populaire et privée, qu'à une vie de plus riche estoffe: chaque homme porte la forme entière de l'humaine condition."¹⁵ A ce stade Montaigne n'a pas d'effort à faire pour aller vers le peuple. Il s'en trouve naturellement tout près, il est comme de plein pied avec lui; les autres lui tournent le dos mais l'accueil du peuple est toujours aimable. Un sentiment assez complexe, où le souci du bien-être d'autrui paraît entrer pour une assez grande part, l'attache au peuple. "je m'addonne volontiers aux petits, soit pour ce qu'il y a plus de gloire, soit par naturelle compassion, qui peult infiniment en moy."¹⁶ Enfin il préférerait ressembler à bien des artisans et à bien des laboureurs sages et heureux plutôt qu'à des personnages haut placés.¹⁷

Nous venons de voir comment Montaigne examine en moraliste la société. Son point de vue pourtant est plutôt celui de l'artiste. Il semblerait que par position le moraliste soit de tendances aristocratiques, car il lui faut montrer le meilleur, au lieu que l'artiste est

¹¹ T. 1, I, xlii, p. 331, A.

¹² T. 3, III, xii, p. 345, B.

¹³ T. 1, I, xviii, p. 94, C.

¹⁴ T. 2, II, xvii, p. 428-429, C.

¹⁵ T. 3, III, ii, p. 27, B.

¹⁶ T. 3, III, xiii, p. 428, B.

¹⁷ T. 2, II, xii, p. 212, B.

démocrate. Les différentes formes de la vie réjouissent l'artiste aussi bien par leur variété que par leur beauté et donc il n'éprouve pas un besoin très vif de hiérarchiser. Tel est Montaigne qui essaie, par l'imagination, de vivre toutes les vies :

Ien croy ayseement des choses diverses à moy Pour me sentir engage à une forme, ie n'y oblige pas le monde, comme chascun faict, et croy et conçoÿ mille contraires façons de vie, et au rebours du commun, receoy plus facilement la difference que la ressemblance en nous ¹⁸

Montaigne prise particulièrement la spontanéité et s'il a pu tergiverser parfois sur sa valeur quand il s'est agi de l'énergie morale, il n'hésite pas en ce qui concerne l'art. Il n'a jamais cru en matière d'art que le travail individuel confère une noblesse additionnelle et nous fasse mieux saisir les différents aspects de la nature :

La vanité de nostre presumption faict que nous aymons mieulx debvoir à nos forces, qu'à sa libéralité (de la nature), nostre suffisance ie priseroy, bien autant des graces toutes miennes et naïfves, que celles que j'aurois esté mendier et quester de l'apprentissage ¹⁹

En conformité avec ce principe il proclame l'égalité de l'art du folk-lore et de l'art conscient : rien n'est sauvage, à l'en croire, dans les productions de la nature et il cite un proverbe gascon pour appuyer son assertion,²⁰ ou bien il conclut de la manière suivante sur les villanelles de Gascogne et sur les chansons de peuples primitifs :

La poésie populaire et purement naturelle a des naïfveté et graces, par où elle se compare à la principale beauté de la poésie parfaite selon l'art ²¹

La pensée de Montaigne lorsqu'il parle de l'éloquence populaire se montre à la fois plus en détail et plus absolue que lorsqu'il traite de l'art du folk-lore :

Nous n'apercevons les graces que poinctues, bouffies et enflées d'artifice celles qui content sous la naïfveté et la simplicité, eschappent ayseement à une vue grossiere comme est la nostre ²²

¹⁸ T 1, I, xxxvii, p. 295, A, C Probablement 1572.

¹⁹ T 2, II, xii, p 175, A.

²⁰ T. 1, I, xxv, p 175, C

²¹ T. 1, I, liv, p 398, C.

²² T 3, III, xii, p 340, B. Seconde moitié de 1585.

Il cherche avec soin la véritable éloquence populaire pour la trouver chez les paysans. Il n'envenimait pas son fils apprendre l'éloquence chez les professionnels de la parole parce que leurs discussions offrent à peine moins de futilité et de désordre que celles des harengers.²³ Son fils se formerait beaucoup mieux, au hasard de la vie et des fréquentations de tavernes, tellement, aux yeux de Montaigne, l'école tend à faire perdre le sens de la nature et de l'art qui sont bien près de se confondre. Le véritable habile, selon lui, reste du peuple. La véritable éloquence se confond avec le langage du peuple, pour le fond aussi bien que pour la forme.

Socrates fait mouvoir son âme d'un mouvement naturel et commun; ainsi dict un paysan, ainsi dict une femme²⁴

La philosophie de Montaigne indique la solution d'un problème actuel que Lucien Romier énonce en ces termes

Une aristocratie peut-elle vivre, agir et se développer sous un régime général de démocratie, sans qu'il en résulte un conflit? C'est très certain du moment qu'on sépare la notion de privilège de l'idée d'aristocratie. Il est de même certain que le régime démocratique, privé de supports d'autorité et reposant sur des principes de caractère moral ou abstrait, a besoin plus que n'importe quel autre régime du soutien d'une aristocratie idéaliste et désintéressée.²⁵

Montaigne "sépare la notion de privilège de l'idée d'aristocratie." Il se prononce aussi sur une question qui implique celle de la rétribution du travail et à ce sujet ses idées s'apparentent à celles d'Eugène Dabit. On doit rappeler ici que l'écrivain met au sommet de sa hiérarchie sociale les âmes héroïques qui ont voulu pratiquer la pauvreté volontaire. En effet, dépassant sa propre sagesse de désintéressement relatif, Montaigne montre le chemin à ceux qui veulent atteindre une plus grande excellence en leur désignant dans le passé les philosophes qui ont été possédés de la plus haute ambition. Ces philosophes ne se sont pas contentés d'être pauvres en esprit, "d'attendre à couvert et en repos les rigueurs de la fortune," ils ont voulu vivre la vie du peuple. Ils ont recherché la pauvreté volontaire et le labeur, "de peur que la fortune ne les surprinst inexpectement et nouveaux au combat."²⁶ Le gouverne-

²³ T 3, III, viii, p 190, B. Environ 1586.

²⁴ T. 3, III, xii, p 340, B. Seconde moitié de 1585.

²⁵ "Réhabilitation des formules aristocratiques," *Anthologie des essayistes français* Paris, Kra, 1929, p 273.

²⁶ Montaigne, t. 2, II, vi, p 55, A. Entre 1571 et 1574.

mept ou le prince doit posséder la même pauvreté d'esprit que l'élite dont il vient d'être question, et pratiquer la plus grande frugalité. Quiconque commande ne devrait pas exiger pour cela un niveau de vie plus élevé :

La liberalité mesme n'est pas bien en son lustre en main souveraine, les privez y ont plus de droit, car à le prendre exactement, un roy n'a rien proprement sien, il se doit soy mesme à aultruy ²⁷

L'écrivain déplore aussi que les lois soient souvent dues à des gens qui manquent à la justice par crainte d'amener davantage d'égalité.²⁸ Pour lui-même il est sceptique sur la nécessité du besoin d'acquérir. Il se contente de peu pour le présent, avoir de quoi subvenir aux besoins pressants et ordinaires lui suffit. Il n'entend pas non plus se préoccuper beaucoup d'assurer sa sécurité matérielle dans l'avenir, car le destin, juge-t-il, de toute façon renverse les prévisions.²⁹ Enfin il est d'avis que le travail du peuple n'est pas tellement différent en dignité du sien propre. Quiconque écrit pour un cercle attache facilement un peu trop d'importance à ce qu'il publie ; nous ne trouvons rien de semblable chez Montaigne, enfermé dans sa bibliothèque. Ceux de son entourage attribuent son ignorance des choses agricoles au dédain et au désir d'exceller dans une science plus haute ; Montaigne se récrie. "il me font mourir."³⁰ Et il ajoute : "Je m'aimerois mieux bon escuyer que bon logitien." Vendre et entretenir des relations douces et justes avec les siens est aussi difficile que d'être soldat, diplomate ou magistrat.³¹ Ainsi l'auteur n'a pas cru au travail noble. On peut dire qu'à tout prendre Montaigne reconnaît aux classes non privilégiées un art de vivre, de sentir et de s'exprimer qu'il admet non seulement comme légitime mais pour lequel il marque souvent de la préférence. Une aristocratie qui aurait présente à l'esprit la leçon qui se dégage de son œuvre ne créerait pas chez le peuple une fausse honte pour la manière dont il s'exprime et ne mériterait pas le reproche de Barrès. "Les pauvres, quelles victimes ! On leur a pris la culture et, en retour, on leur montre la civilisation dans un lointain inaccessible."³² Propriété-

²⁷ T 3, III, vi, p 157 et 158 1586-1587

²⁸ T 3, III, xiii, p 389-390, B, C. 1587

²⁹ T 1, I, xiv, p. 80, B, C.

³⁰ T 3, III, ix, p 224-225, B, C Entre 1586 et 1588

³¹ T. 3, III, ii, p 32, B 1586.

³² *Amori et Dolori Sacrum*, 1921, p 2.

taire avec humour, Montaigne a séparé la notion de privilège de l'idée d'aristocratie. En parlant du peuple il a trouvé des accents empreints d'une tendresse que l'on distingue seulement chez quelques écrivains: La Fontaine, Bossuet, Barrès.³³ Il s'agit en effet de bien autre chose que d'aller au peuple et de s'occuper de son bien-être comme ont pu le faire ceux que Péguy a appelés "les touristes de la misère." Il s'agit d'établir avec lui des rapports humains et c'est ce qu'a fait Montaigne.

JEAN DAVID

University of Washington

MALHERBE, SAINT-GELAYS, TABOUROT, THEOPHILE,
AND THE *JARDIN DES MUSES*

1. Seventeenth- and eighteenth-century anthologies are infested with false ascriptions, and little or no reliance can be placed on their attributions to authors of an earlier period if other evidence is wanting. At the same time it is often difficult to find positive proof that a given attribution is mistaken, especially in the case of literary trifles, so that a modern editor may feel obliged to fill an appendix with pieces which he is morally certain his author never wrote. Thus M. Jacques Lavaud in his recent critical edition of Malherbe's poems¹ prints among 'poésies attribuées à Malherbe' the following verses ascribed to the poet in the *Jardin des Muses* (1642 or 1643):

³³ Pas plus chez Barrès que chez Montaigne il ne s'agit d'humilité, question qui probablement obligerait à sortir de la littérature pour entrer dans la théologie. Il est seulement dit que ces écrivains ont perçu les mêmes réalités que le peuple et se sont trouvés en communion avec lui. On peut détacher à titre d'exemple chez Barrès, *op cit*, p. 172, Elizabeth Hohenstaufen: "Certains hommes me sont aussi agréables que les arbres ou la mer. Je pense aux pêcheurs des côtes, aux paysans et aux fous de village." Dans *Le Jardin de Bérénice*, p. 50, Bérénice ou Petite Secousse n'aime pas les triomphants: "Je félicitai Petite Secousse d'avoir choisi précisément l'âne et le canard, pauvres compagnons, à l'ordinaire sevrés de caresses et même de confortable . . . Leur volonté amortie de brouillards, leur entêtement de besogneux, elle comprenait tout cela sans dédain ni répugnance . . . Ma Bérénice comme vous êtes près de mon cœur."

¹ *Les Poésies de M. de Malherbe*, Paris (E. Droz), 1937, 2 305.

INSCRIPTION POUR UNE FONTAINE

Je pense, ô luisante et belle eau,
 Que jadis les Grâces dansèrent
 Dessus ton bord et y laissèrent
 Tout ce qu'on y voit de plus beau

Lavaud comments 'Laissés de côté par Ménage, absolument inconnus par ailleurs, rien ne laisse supposer que [ces vers] soient authentiques' Something very like them, however, is known elsewhere, since they are derived, with some little modification, from the following epigram in the *Touches* of Etienne Tabourot ²

SUR UNE FONTAINE DES GRACES

Je pense, ô belle et claire eau,
 Que les Graces se laverent
 Dedans toy, puis y laisserent
 Ce qui est en toy de beau

The epigram is a translation from the Greek Anthology (A.P. 9.607), a source which supplied Tabourot with some two hundred and seventy-five of his 'touches.' No doubt the *rifacimento* is an improvement on Tabourot,³ but it is not at all likely to have been the work of Malherbe, while there is some chance of its having been made by the collector of the *Jardin des Muses*, Pierre Guillebaud.⁴ He, at all events, had been reading the *Touches*, since he included in his anthology ten extracts from this source, duly assigned to Tabourot (Des Accords)⁵ Several of these also are in a more or less altered text.⁶

² *Les Touches du seigneur des Accords*, Paris (Richer), 1585, 241. I use the 'Raretés Bibliographiques' reprint, Brussels, 1863

³ Apart from the verbal agreements and the rhymes, the following consideration proves that we have to do with a reworking of Tabourot, and not with an independent imitation of the Greek original. This original celebrates a bath, for which Tabourot has substituted a fountain, retaining, however, the notion that the Graces bathed therein. The reviser knew nothing of the Greek, probably thought it odd that the Graces (as distinguished from nymphs) should bathe in a fountain, and hence made them dance, more decorously, upon the margin.

⁴ On Guillebaud see Nicéron, *Mém.* 19 137, where he is noticed as a careless compiler. Another anthology, the *Hortus Epitaphiorum* (1648) is credited to him by Nicéron, a fact that seems to have escaped Lachèvre.

⁵ Since the *Jardin des Muses* is not accessible to me, I depend on the description by Fr. Lachèvre, *Bibliographie des recueils collectifs* (1597-1700), Paris, 1903, 2.13-16, 484.

⁶ This statement is founded only on the initial words of the epigrams as

2. Depending on an ascription made in the same *Jardin des Muses*, Molinier included in his book on Saint-Gelays the following epigram (also from the Greek Anthology, A. P. 11.251).⁷

LES TROIS SOURDS

Un sourd fit un sourd assigner
Devant un sourd dans un village,
Puis s'en vint son droict entonner
La demande estoit d'un fromage,
L'autre respond du laborage
Le juge, estant sur le suspens,
Déclara bon le mariage,
Et les renvoya sans despens

Philipp August Becker remarks with justice that these verses hardly have the ring of the first half of the sixteenth century.⁸ It escaped both Molinier and Becker, however, that, with minor variations, they regularly appear among the epigrams of Pellisson.⁹ The variations are *ajourner* (1), *en* (2), *Et puis s'en vint haut entonner / Qu'il avoit volé son fromage* (3-4), and *ce suspens* (6). These changes may be regarded as improvements, and hence Pellisson is probably not the author, but only a reviser of the lines; it seems unlikely that they appear in his (posthumous) works by sheer accident. He was interested in the Greek epigrams, of which he has eight other translations, and hence we may suppose that he was moved to extract this version from the *Jardin des Muses* and touch it up.¹⁰

given by Lachèvre; I have at present no way of knowing how deep the alterations go

⁷ Henri-Joseph Molinier, *Mémoires de Saint-Gelays*, Rodez, 1910, p. 417.

⁸ *Sitzungsber. d. Akad. d. Wiss. in Wien, Phil.-hist., Kl.* 200 4 (1924) 62

⁹ In La Martinière's *Nouveau recueil des épigrammatistes français*, Amsterdam, 1720, 1 238, in Pellisson's *Œuvres diverses*, Paris, 1735, 1 216; in the *Bibliothèque poétique*, Paris, 1745, 2 392

¹⁰ So far as the dates go it is not altogether impossible for Pellisson to have had a translation from the Greek printed in the *Jardin*; he was nineteen in 1643, and was precocious, having finished his humanities at the age of eleven. But he seems not to appear in the *recueils* until ten years later, in the *Poésies choisies*, Paris (Ch. de Sercey), 1653 (Lachèvre, *op. cit.* 4 573). And why ascribe his work to Saint-Gelays? In any case, he could never have written the original vv. 3-4. Through some error Pellisson's revised version (if it is his) is assigned to 'M D M* M*.' in the *Recueil du Parnasse*, Paris, 1743, 2 1.42. The unrevised form again

Are we, then, thrown back on Saint-Gelays? Not if I understand the *Jardin des Muses* and its editor. Immediately following this imitation of *A. P.* 11.251 there fatally appears that of Tabourot.¹¹

LES SOURDS

Un sourd fit un sourd assigner
 Devant un juge à eux semblable
 Qui n'eut pas entendu tonner
 La demande fut d'une estable,
 La défense d'un mund de sable,
 Lors le juge sans s'estonner
 Déclare qu'il est raisonnable
 Qu'ils s'en aillent tous trois disner,
 Afin de s'accorder à table.

It is not easy to suppose that Guillebaud had found out and brought together two imitations, so much alike, of the same Greek epigram, he is more likely to have himself fashioned the one that is known only from his book. If so, he has again improved on Tabourot, and has again assigned his revision to an earlier author. That the one version springs from the other is clear from the verbal correspondences. That Tabourot's is the original is guaranteed not only by the fact that his *Touches* are borrowed wholesale from the Anthology (though Saint-Gelays to some extent uses this source), but also by the fact that he never founds his imitations on other French imitations, and still more by the manner of imitation which attains precisely the degree of freedom that is common in Tabourot's epigrams from the Greek.¹² Finally, his version is the cruder, the other an improvement, which needed only the hand of Pellisson to turn it into an acceptable epigram. The fact that two dubious ascriptions in the *Jardin des Muses* offer them-

is given as anonymous in the *Nouveau trésor du Parnasse*, 1772, 444, and in the *Délassemens* of Du Clot de la Vorze, 1809, 1359

¹¹ The text here printed is that of the 1585 *Touches* (161), that given in the *Jardin* seems as usual to be corrupt—at least Lachèvre reports the first line as, *Un sourd fit assigner un sourd*

¹² The following is Paton's (Loeb) translation of *A. P.* 11.251. A stone-deaf man went to law with another stone-deaf man, and the judge was much deafer than the pair of them. One of them contended that the other owed him five months' rent, and the other said that his opponent had ground corn at night [to avoid a tax]. Says the judge, looking at them. 'Why are you quarreling? She is your mother, you must both maintain her.'

selves thus to the same explanation, tends to corroborate the explanation in each case.¹³

3. A further observation points in the same direction. It has been mentioned above that Lachèvre finds ten pieces in the *Jardin des Muses* ascribed to Tabourot by name. A glance through his table of anonymous poems, however, raises a suspicion that the *Touches* are actually more widely represented. Thus an anonymous epigram entitled *Sur un Bourguignon* (Lachèvre 2583) begins: 'Le sel que l'on voit meslé.' This can hardly be anything but the commendatory epigram by Fr Juret placed at the front of the 1585 *Touches* (Tabourot came from Dijon):

Le sel que tu as meslé
Dans ces vers, de bonne grace,
Monstie qu'ils sont de la race
D'un vray Bourguignon salé

Others look equally certain:

1. Un avare se vouloit pendre (Lachèvre 2639), cf Tabourot Un avare se voulut pendre (*Touch* 149)

2 Thoinet, tu masches un peu trop vite (Lachèvre 2634), cf Tabourot Mon valet, tu masches trop vite (*Touch* 212)¹⁴

3 Pluton voyant le medecin Torcy (Lachèvre 2609), cf. Tabourot Pluton voyant Sylve le medecin (*Touch* 221)

4 Au monde nu je suis venu (Lachèvre 2518); cf Tabourot. Comme au monde je suis venu / Je m'en retournerai tout nu (*Touch* 29)

If these are, as they seem to be, borrowings from Tabourot, they have been modified in the process. For example, No. 3 was originally in praise of Jacques Dubois ('Sylve'), the well-known regius professor of medicine in Tabourot's day; while in the *Jardin* it is transferred to one Torcy whom I fail to identify.

4. A last point perhaps does not involve the editor of the *Jardin*. There appear therein a certain number of poems ascribed to Théophile de Viau, and not found elsewhere. Lachèvre reprints them in full in an appendix. One of these seems to be an imitation of the

¹³ Lachèvre himself notices (*op. cit.* 2590) an anonymous piece in the *Jardin des Muses* as an awkward plagiarism of Maynard

¹⁴ The title of the verses in the *Jardin* is *Contre un laquais*. Tabourot has an epigram (161) beginning, 'Thoinot marche si vistement,' both his epigrams being imitations of the same Greek epigram (*A P* 11.431) the point of which turns on 'eating fast' and 'walking fast'

same Greek epigram imitated by Tabourbot in No. 4 above, and is as follows (Lachèvre 2.738) :

Je naquis au monde tout nud,
Je ne sçay combien je vivray,
Si je n'ay rien quand je mourray,
Je n'auray gagné ny perdu

Tabourot has in fact two imitations of the Greek original (*A.P.* 10 58) in his *Touches*, but neither resembles this one. By chance, however, something that does resemble it has been inserted into Tabourot's *Bigarrures*, probably first in the edition of 1603 (Paris, Richer) .¹⁵

Nud du ciel je suis descendu,
Et nud je suis sous cette pierre,
Donc pour estre venu sur terre,
Je n'ay gagné ny perdu

That the two versions are related seems clear from the last line, and that the one ascribed to Théophile is the derivative is probable from the fact that it blurs the point. The Greek original says: 'To earth came I naked, naked shall I go beneath the earth. why do I toil in vain, seeing that the end is nakedness?'¹⁶

JAMES HUTTON

Cornell University

¹⁵ I have not been able to inspect this edition, and can only refer to the edition of Rouen, 1625 (p 357); but the best information available (Brunet, *Manuel* 5 629) suggests that subsequent seventeenth-century editions all repeat this modified edition of 1603. Tabourot had died about 1590. The epigram here quoted is one of a group of which the editor, probably André Pasquet, says. 'Estant à Orléans en l'an 1600 on me donna ces suivants'

¹⁶ The version quoted from the *Bigarrures* was printed, no doubt from this source, in the *Recueil des plus excellens vers satyriques de ce temps*, Paris, 1617, a book with which Théophile was presumably familiar (*Le Parnasse satyrique . . . avec le Recueil des plus excellens vers satyriques*, Ghent-Paris, 1861, 2 173). This anthology contains, without the names or authors, a considerable amount of old material. I note in passing some further examples: *Vœu de Martine* (ed. cit. 2 165) belongs to Baif (ed. by Marty-Laveaux 4 292). *A Nacquet* (2.168) is also by Baif (4.318), *D'Agathe* (2 198) is by Vauquelin de la Fresnaye (ed. by Travers, p 627); and *Quatram* (2.201) is by Jean Doublet (*Élégies*, Paris, 1871, p. 141).

THE ADJECTIVE *GOTHIQUE* IN THE XVIIIth CENTURY

As anyone knows, there occurred during the XVIIIth century in France social and intellectual changes which would surely be reflected in the vocabulary of the time.¹ And yet for that period there are few general linguistic studies and almost no detailed studies of individual words. Now one of the most obvious traits of the age is its changing attitude toward the Middle Ages, and no one word better reflects that change than does the critical adjective *gothique*.

While, as with its English cognate,² the significant history of *gothique*, as used of manners and literary style, begins with the XVIIIth century, there are numerous earlier instances of its use. *Gothique* expressed the normal attitude of educated Renaissance society toward the Middle Ages: the humanists used the word when referring to the degradation of the French language, as Gargantua used the noun in his famous letter to Pantagruel (II, 8) "Le temps estoit encores tenebreux et sentant l'infelicité et calamité des Gothz, qui avoient mis à destruction toute bonne littérature" And from two examples one can see that in the course of the XVIIth century the word *gothique* had come to mean "archaic, uncouth, ugly, barbarous." Boileau uses it of both poetical composition and behavior in the *Art poétique* (1674; II, 21-22) he writes with a fine disregard for Ronsard's classical training, that when a "rimeur aux abois" brings all sorts of incongruities into an idyll, "On diroit que Ronsard, sur ses pipeaux rustiques, Vient encor fredonner ses idylles gothiques." And in *le Lutrin* (1683; v, 139-140) he calls a "fureur gothique" the book-throwing frenzy of the embattled cantors and canons.³

¹ Brunot, *Histoire de la langue française*, VI, 1094 "Les mœurs de la société du XVIII^e siècle se reflètent dans son jargon . . . Les conventions mondaines agissent sur les mots les plus simples. . . . On pourrait faire des observations du même genre sur *gaulois*, *gothique* . . . tous mots dont le sens est modelé par l'opinion mondaine."

² See A. E. Longueil, "The Word 'Gothic' in XVIIIth Century Criticism," *MLN*, xxxviii (1923). This article deals only with English criticism and shows the later XVIIIth century connotations of *gothic* to have been quite different from what they were in France.

³ For further examples see G. Cayrou, *le Français classique: lexique de la langue française du XVII^e siècle*, 1923.

In the first half of the XVIIIth century it is this application of the word to conduct that appears to be the most frequent; *gaulois* is sometimes used with the same meaning. What is old-fashioned, not practised by "la bonne compagnie," is *gothique* "On a banni ces longs préludes . . . ces sentiments de fidèle pasteur . . . enfin toutes les formalités romanesques Et se piquer à présent d'être galant, c'est vouloir passer pour Gaulois." ⁴ "Allez apprendre les usages du monde; défaites-vous de vos façons d'aimer gothiques." ⁵ "Dans vos sentiments je vous trouve gothique." ⁶ "Cette barbarie gothique qu'on ose nommer chrétienne." ⁷ "Affichez la sagesse, on vous trouve gothique, Ayez une aventure, on vous en prête cent" ⁸

This connotation of *gothique*, become conventional by mid-century, continues well beyond 1750: for example, Cidalise of Palissot's *les Philosophes* (1760) calls her husband (I, 5) a "défenseur ennuyeux des préjugés gothiques" In a satire of 1770 on Young and his *Nuits* the author accuses Young of proposing "des maximes gothiques et folles, injurieuses à la sagesse de Dieu." ⁹ In Dorat's *le Célibataire* (1775) one of the ladies declares (II, 7): "Je tiens aux vieilles mœurs, aux décences antiques. C'est ma façon de voir, elle est des plus gothiques" And still later Béranger: "J'aime à fronder les préjugés gothiques." ¹⁰

There are a few instances of *gothique* applied in much the same derogatory sense to literary efforts: Bayle, in the *Réponse aux questions d'un provincial* (1704; ch. LXIII), writes of an obscure author: "La manière d'écrire de cet auteur est du dernier détestable elle est confuse, pedantesque, & plus que Gothique." ¹¹ Chévrier in the *Épître dédicatoire to le Colporteur* (ca. 1755):

⁴ Autreau, *Port à l'Anglois* (1718), II, 16

⁵ Monicault, *le Dédain affecté* (1724), I, 4

⁶ Boissy, *l'Impertinent malgré lui* (1729), II, 6

⁷ Voltaire, *Lettres philosophiques* (1734), XXIII, referring to pious condemnations of the theatre.

⁸ Desmahis, *l'Impertinent* (1750), sc 3 Cf Leroux, *Dictionnaire comique*, etc (1735) "OSTROGOT Mot injudieux qui signifie sot, ignorant, faquin", and Gorsas, *l'Ane promeneur* (1786), p 56. "J'ai fait un auto-da-fé . . . de l'ostrogot Corneille"

⁹ Quoted by P Van Tieghem, *le Préromantisme* (1924-30), II, 184

¹⁰ Quoted by Littré, s v GOTHIQUE

¹¹ *Gaulois*, on the other hand, did not necessarily have such an unfavorable meaning, for "style gaulois" was the term used by late XVIIth century imitators of Marot to denote their own conventional archaisms.

"... production gothique que je vous conseille de mettre en françois." Rousseau refers to the "gothique ton" of *la Nouvelle Héloïse*, i. e. its "fautes de langue . . . stile emphatique et plat . . . pensées communes rendues en termes empoulés." In Bachaumont (5 avril 1771) Mme de Gomez is mentioned as having "composé une bibliothèque de romans, tous gothiques, dans le genre de l'ancienne galanterie."¹²

There was one literary connection, however, in which *gothique* was used without a sneer. coupled with the word *tragédie* it meant merely "medieval," or as we might say, "pre-classical"; so that a *tragédie gothique* was a *mystère*. I find in Gaillard de la Bataille, *Vie et amours de Mlle Cronel*, etc. (1883: II, 134): "... les tragédies gothiques où l'on représentoit des passions et des martyrs." And in *les Entretiens du Palais-Royal* (1786; II, 91): "je parlois une fois de ces pièces gothiques au savant Père Berthier. . . . [Il se] rappela des fragmens d'une vieille tragédie . . . [qui] avoit pour sujet la conversion de Saint-Augustin."

Occasionally, as in the following quotation from the *Variétés philosophiques* (1762; p. 120), *gothique* has more than one affective meaning; in this case three: chronological, architectural and the common deprecatory one, with here an added reference to primitive darkness and irregularity. "Le centre de Paris ne subsiste-t-il point encore tel que le virent les premiers tems de la Monarchie! et quand on se trouve dans cet étroit & Gothique labyrinthe. . ." Irregularity is the essential meaning of *gothique* as it is used of the arts: in fact, it is the only use of the term recognized by the chevalier de Jaucourt in the *Encyclopédie*.¹³

So far all save one of the connotations of *gothique* that I have mentioned are derogatory. But during the first half of the XVIIIth century certain obscure and complex forces were working toward a rehabilitation of the Middle Ages. That rehabilitation has been so thoroughly studied—and so variously explained—that we can accept it as a fact and proceed to view its reflection in the vocabu-

¹² These were not "Gothic" novels in the English sense. although Walpole's *Château d'Otrante, roman gothique*, had appeared in 1767, the adjective *gothique* still meant to Bachaumont "outmoded." See A. M. Killen, *le Roman terrifiant*, etc. (1923), pp 75-78.

¹³ *GOTHIQUE*, (Maniere) en Peint. C'est . . . une maniere qui ne reconnoît aucune regle, qui n'est dirigée par aucune étude de l'antique . . . cette maniere barbare . . .

lary of the second half of the century. With the "retour au sentiment" and as the result of a "nostalgie du primitif," of a sketchy knowledge of the nation's past and of the XVIIIth century tendency to adapt everything "au goût moderne," not only were the romances of the Middle Ages prettified but the reading public derived from them and other second-hand sources a set of idealized notions concerning "Gothic" life. Writers and readers of the second half of the century lent to medieval men and women the virtues that Tacitus granted to the Germans in order to satirize the vices of Rome, the virtues with which Macpherson endowed almost all the Ossianic heroes. And because for a time nobody was conscious of racial or national distinctions, even less of chronological ones, all medieval men were pictured as courageous, loyal, sober, chaste, honest and sincere.¹⁴

Gothique having long since acquired an opprobrious overtone, writers who wished to refer approvingly to whatever was medieval were obliged to use equivalents. As Poinssinet de Sivry put it, in *la Berlue* (1759, p. 145) · "Nous redemanderons le gotique comme quelque chose de neuf, et nous l'adopterons", but without calling it *gothique* at first. For some time phrases like *le bon vieux temps* or words like *antique*, *chevaleresque*, *féodal* (and later *troubadour*, used as an adjective) evoke the idealized picture of the Middle Ages:

Le bon vieux tems n'est plus, le siècle dégénere,
L'amour était jadis tendre, discret, sincere . ¹⁵

Tu sais que d'un peu de bêtise
Le bon vieux temps est accusé:
Mais dans ce siècle plus rusé,
J'ai grand regret à la franchise
De l'âge d'or si méprisé ¹⁶

Ne ferois-je point pitié à nos Militaires Philosophes, si je représentois Bayard s'écriant, lorsqu'il se sent blessé d'un coup d'arquebuse, *Jésus! hélas, mon Dieu! je suis mort!* . . . Ce seroit-là le radotage d'un homme du bon vieux tems ¹⁷

The subtitle of Sedaine's *Aucassin et Nicolette* (1779) is *les*

¹⁴ Bernis, *Oeuvres mêlées* (1759), Epître II "Ces âges, traités de gotiques, Etoient les âges des Bayarts"

¹⁵ *Oeuvres du philosophe de Sans-Souci* (1760), Epître XVII

¹⁶ Bernis, *op. cit.*, Epître VIII

¹⁷ *Variétés philosophiques et littéraires* (1762), pp. 239-240.

Amours du bon vieux temps, but Grétry, explaining later in his *Souvenirs* how the music of the play was supposed to suggest the Middle Ages, writes: "D'ailleurs les chants anciens devaient être pour les paroles gothiques qui se trouvaient répandues dans le poème comme 'Nicolette ma douce amie.'" ¹⁸ Here *gothiques* is plainly a positive word, underlining the " quaintness " of the libretto.

During the first half of the XVIIIth century *gothique* was used most frequently of manners, but when the shift in its connotation occurred manners were about the last thing to which it was applied favorably. (What more natural than that the sense in which it was used most emphatically should have been the one to persist longest?) In its architectural meaning, for instance, the word had been virtually neutral, influenced by fashionable modernity and anti-medievalism less in that sense than in its more figurative ones. Then, as we know, with the "retour au sentiment," at first ruins, then Gothic ruins—doubtless because French ruins were usually Gothic—and at last Gothic architecture in general came to be identified with melancholy moods; to such a degree finally that the two were well nigh inseparable, as in Chateaubriand's *René*: "Amélie . . . entendit retentir, sous les voûtes du château gothique, le chant des prêtres du convoi. . . . Au milieu de mes réflexions, l'heure venait frapper . . . dans la tour de la cathédrale gothique. . . . Hélas! chaque heure dans la société ouvre un tombeau et fait couler des larmes." Even before the heyday of Romanticism versifiers had worked to death this identification of the Gothic with the sombre:

Dans les tours du château gothique
Gémissaient les brises du nord,
Et la chouette prophétique
De Laurence annonçait la mort ¹⁹

But before Chateaubriand had stereotyped *gothique* by allying it with *romantique*, ²⁰ the word could be used of conduct in a com-

¹⁸ Quoted by Cucuel, "le Moyen âge dans les opéras-comiques du XVIII^e siècle," *Revue du XVIII^e siècle*, janvier-mars 1914.

¹⁹ Lorrando, *Edgar et Laurence*, 1818, quoted by Jacoubet, *le Genre troubadour*, etc (1929), p. 106

²⁰ *Essai sur les révolutions*, written probably in 1795; quoted by Baldensperger, "'Romantique,' ses analogues et ses équivalents: tableau

mentatory sense which demonstrates a shift away from the Classical, conformist attitude toward the individualistic and Romantic:

On nous fit voir un abbé, que l'amour de la solitude avoit rendu l'homme le plus érudit . . . C'est lui qui jadis livré au tourbillon du monde, avoit cru devoir troquer les futilités du siècle pour de sages réflexions, et qui se trouvoit à merveille d'un pareil marché Il paroissoit un homme gothique entre mille petits individus qui ne méritoient pas de l'approcher C'est un aigle, me disoit Mylord, entre des routelets.²¹

So far as I have been able to discover, *gothique* did not at any time, as it did in English, mean "ghastly, supernatural or super-human"; it was not used to express, as the term "Gothic novel" eventually did, "the first terror-stricken meeting of the England of Elizabeth with the Italy of the Renaissance."²²

What in the end robbed the word of its favorable overtones was the serious medieval scholarship of the 1830's. A few samples of the real thing and a few whiffs of pungent prose were enough to dispel the pseudo-Gothic perfume which had been given off by songs and comic operas, those "premières fleurs qui s'épanouissent à l'ombre des cathédrales,"²³ and which had been distilled by Tressan from old romances until it had become one of Romanticism's dominant odors, gone utterly rank in the printing of Lenglé's *Ballades, fabliaux et traditions du moyen âge* (1828) in Gothic characters!

With the decline of story-book medievalism *gothique* reverted to its earlier meaning, which perhaps it had never lost completely; so in Delvau, *Dictionnaire de la langue verte* (2nd ed., 1867): "GOTHIQUE, adj. Vieux, suranné,—dans l'argot du peuple"; and in the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* (8th ed., 1932): "GOTHIQUE. Il se dit figurément et familièrement de ce qui paraît trop ancien, hors de mode, désuet. *Raisonnements, manières, idées gothiques.*"

WM. C. HOLBROOK

Northwestern University

synoptique de 1650 à 1810," *Harvard Studies & Notes in Philology & Literature*, XIX (1937) "Le tableau des nations barbaresques offre je ne sais quoi de romantique qui nous attire des vestiges, jadis qualifiés de Gothiques ou de tudesques, aujourd'hui de *romantic.*"

²¹ *Les Entretiens du Palais-Royal* (1786), I, 34

²² C. T. McIntyre, "Were the 'Gothic novels' Gothic?", *PMLA*, XXXVI (1921).

²³ Cucuel, *op cit.*

VOLTAIRE À D'ARGENTAL (juillet 1759)

Le rétablissement du texte exact de cette "véritable histoire du dix-huitième siècle" qu'est la correspondance de Voltaire est une tâche aussi indispensable que pénible, point encouragé par l'assertion de Moland que "les originaux de tout l'ancien fonds (Beuchot) n'existent plus."¹ Heureusement, le fameux érudit paraît s'être trompé à cet égard. La preuve en est une lettre originale adressée au comte d'Argental, provenant de l'ancien fonds de Beuchot, qui se trouve dans la possession du soussigné depuis peu de temps. Entièrement écrite de la main de Voltaire et imprimée dans les "Oeuvres,"² le texte y est reproduit avec des infidélités qui, légères en apparence, valent néanmoins la peine d'être relevées. De plus, cette lettre est dépourvue de notes explicatives, nécessaires à sa compréhension.

Quoique adressée à d'Argental ("mon divin ange") personnellement, la dernière phrase montre qu'elle était aussi destinée à être lue par Mme la comtesse d'Argental, née Mlle du Bouchet, la "Mme Scaliger" de Voltaire. Voici le texte fidèle selon l'original:

juillet 1759

mon divin ange que vous dirai-je? rien qui ne soit dans le paquet cy joint votre chambrier d'espagnac, le p^d des brosses, l'intendant, les fermiers généraux et mes massons ont conjuré ma ruine elle est complète les chevaliers et les czars ne s'en trouveront pas mieux je suis malade—les affaires me pilent je baise les ailes des anges pour me consoler.³

Depuis l'achat du domaine de Tournay, en décembre 1758, Voltaire avait avec *le président de Brosses* une correspondance qui traînait et devenait de plus en plus tendue, au sujet des difficultés résultant de la transaction. C'est notre lettre de juillet 1759 que l'on peut considérer comme ayant ouvert la querelle. Dans les questions des droits de contrôle, du centième denier et des réparations à faire à Tournay, Voltaire se heurtait aux *fermiers généraux*. En écrivant la lettre, il devait surtout penser à M. de Faventine et à M. Douet qui étaient chargés du domaine de Tournay.

¹ *Oeuvres de Voltaire*, éd. Moland, XXXIII (I de la correspondance), VII.

² *Ibid*, XL, 143

³ Je suis heureux d'exprimer la reconnaissance que je dois à mon père, John H. I. Remak, qui m'a procuré le manuscrit.

En outre, les *maçons* employés à l'érection du théâtre à Tournay et du château à Ferney devaient être surveillés étroitement et l'exaspéraient constamment. Quant à *l'intendant*, nous trouvons dans l'édition de Beuchot⁴ en bas de la lettre une note se rapportant à une autre lettre écrite à d'Argental, des Délices, le 18 juillet 1755 (!), dans laquelle Voltaire mentionne "M de La Valette, intendant de Bourgogne."⁵ Au bas de la même page, Beuchot note: "Jean François Joly de Fleuri de La Valette, intendant de Bourgogne depuis 1749." Par contre, Moland préfère rester muet au sujet de l'identité de cet intendant. En ce qui concerne Joly de Fleuri, le contact désagréable entre lui et Voltaire semble être dû à la fameuse affaire Panchaud, qui commença en 1758. Mais l'examen approfondi des dates nous apporte une surprise. La première mention de cette affaire dans la correspondance de Voltaire paraît être contenue dans la lettre à Fabry écrite probablement au commencement du mois d'août 1759⁶. Une autre lettre du patriarche du 28 mai 1760⁷ confirme cette date. ". . . les juges du bailliage de Gex firent, l'année passée au mois d'août, une procédure bien vive contre un Suisse. . . ." Nous devons donc conclure que Voltaire ne se mit à s'occuper sérieusement de cette affaire qu'après la composition de notre lettre. Il n'y a pas d'indications qui nous permettent de supposer que Voltaire se préoccupait de Joly de Fleuri en juillet 1759 pour quelque raison que ce soit. L'explication de Beuchot—non contredite par Moland—est, par conséquent, fort contestable.

Très probablement, notre *intendant* est celui à qui Voltaire avait affaire relativement au centième denier exigé par les fermiers généraux pour Tournay. C'était Jacques-Bernard Chauvelin, qu'il ne faut point confondre avec ses frères l'ambassadeur François Claude, marquis de Chauvelin, ami de Voltaire pour lequel le vieux philosophe fit jouer "Tancred" au théâtre de Tournay, en octobre 1759, et l'abbé Henri-Philippe Chauvelin, dont les écrits anti-jésuites furent défendus par Voltaire ("Répliques aux apologues des jésuites," 1762). D'Argental, ami intime et de François-Claude de Chauvelin et de Voltaire, avait évidemment amené

⁴ *Œuvres de Voltaire*, éd. Beuchot, LVIII, 143.

⁵ *Ibid.*, LVI, 673.

⁶ *Œuvres de Voltaire*, éd. Moland, L, 419.

⁷ *Ibid.*, XL, 401.

l'ambassadeur à intercéder en faveur de Voltaire auprès de son frère l'intendant. De plus, le *divin ange* et le marquis sauvegardèrent tous les deux les intérêts du "Suisse" dans les négociations avec le conseil du dernier prince de Conti (1734-1814), connu longtemps sous le nom de "comte de La Marche," qui était engagiste du pays de Gex, où Tournay et Ferney étaient situés. C'est avec le chef du conseil du comte de La Marche, l'abbé d'Espagnac, que Voltaire était aux prises au sujet du droit de mouvance, des lods et ventes d'une dîme de Ferney. Leurs discussions concernant Tournay datent de plus tard.

Or, la confusion règne dans la Table Générale de Moland⁸ en ce qui concerne cet abbé d'Espagnac. Charles Pierrot, rédacteur de cette table, n'a pas vu qu'il y avait deux abbés d'Espagnac, et que le plus fameux d'entre eux, l'abbé Marc-René d'Espagnac, auteur de l'"Eloge de Catinat" (1775) et du "Panégyrique de St. Louis" (1777) n'avait que sept ans en 1759. Ce n'est donc pas à lui que Voltaire put penser au moment de la composition de notre lettre, mais plutôt à l'oncle de Marc-René, l'abbé de Sahuguet d'Espagnac (mort en 1781), conseiller de grand'chambre depuis 1737, chef du conseil de La Marche, et appelé le "Grand Abbé" pour le distinguer de son neveu le "Petit Abbé." Maintes fois en 1759 et 1760, Voltaire en parle en termes ironiques. C'est lui qui "glaça son imagination," c'est lui qu'il appelle le "minutieux seigneur,"⁹ "raboteux" et "difficile"¹⁰ En effet, les négociations avec le "Grand Abbé" se prolongèrent jusqu'en mars 1760. C'est encore le même que Voltaire nomme dix-sept ans plus tard quand il recommande le "Petit Abbé" à d'Alembert avec ces mots: "... il est de plus, neveu d'un conseiller de grand'chambre, qui rabat quelquefois les coups que le fanatisme porte à cette philosophie tant persécutée."¹¹ La confusion à l'égard des deux Espagnac s'explique non seulement par l'intérêt subséquent que Voltaire témoignera au "Petit Abbé," mais encore par ses relations cordiales avec le père du "Petit Abbé," le général Jean-Baptiste de Sahuguet d'Amarzit d'Espagnac (1713-1783), gouverneur de l'Hôtel des Invalides et auteur de l'"Histoire de Maurice, comte de Saxe" vivement louée par Voltaire.¹²

⁸ *Ibid.*, LI, 355. ⁹ *Ibid.*, XL, 264. ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, XL, 133. ¹¹ *Ibid.*, I, 131.

¹² Les références au général Jean-Baptiste Sahuguet, baron d'Espagnac, dans la *Table Analytique* sont correctes. Par contre, il faut créditer le

Passons aux allusions littéraires de la lettre. Le 22 avril 1759, Voltaire commença une tragédie nommée "Tancrède", le 28 mai, le "vieux fou" envoya son "Tancrède" à d'Argental. Celui-ci le retourna peu après avec ses observations et celles de sa femme. Mais les difficultés qui harassaient Voltaire à ce moment l'empêchèrent de finir la *chevalerie*, comme il appelait "Tancrède," en faisant allusion aux chevaliers qui défendent Syracuse dans le drame. En effet, ce ne fut que huit mois plus tard, en mars 1760, et après avoir obtenu l'avis flatteur du duc de Villars sur l'œuvre, qu'il envoya le manuscrit quasi définitif (car nul manuscrit de Voltaire n'était définitif avant que le rideau s'ouvrit ou plutôt tombât sur son drame) aux "anges." L'autre œuvre dont l'exécution fut retardée par les préoccupations de l'auteur fut l'"Histoire de l'Empire de Russie sous Pierre le Grand," dont le second tome n'apparut qu'en 1763 (le premier fut publié à la fin de 1759). Ainsi la phrase: "les chevaliers et les czars ne s'en trouveront pas mieux" n'a plus rien d'obscur.¹³

Reste un seul mystère à éclaircir: qu'y avait-il dans le *paquet* qui accompagna notre lettre? Il se peut que Voltaire y mît quelques feuilles séparées du "Tancrède" pour demander l'opinion de ses amis sur des corrections, mais il est bien plus probable qu'il leur envoya des documents relatifs aux diverses affaires contentieuses engendrées par l'acquisition de Ferney et de Tournay, vu qu'Argental était son intermédiaire à Paris.

Restituée et annotée, notre lettre tend à faire ressortir les soucis de Voltaire, gentilhomme campagnard et écrivain. Cependant, n'oublions pas que c'est le même Voltaire qui écrit à d'Argental quelques semaines après: "Je me plains toujours, selon l'usage; mais, dans le fond, je suis fort aise."¹⁴

HENRY H. H. REMAK

Indiana University

"Grand Abbé" d'Espagnac, frère du baron, non seulement des deux premières références faussement attribuées à "l'abbé d'Espagnac, fils du baron" (XL, 165; XLI, 4), mais aussi des mentions suivantes trouvées dans le tome XL, qui jettent de la lumière sur l'affaire Voltaire-Espagnac: XL, 122, 125, 133, 142, 143, 156, 165, 201, 204, 264, 282, 294, 320, 322, 323, 331, 338. Les autres références à l'abbé d'Espagnac dans la table doit être attribué au "Petit Abbé," l'écrivain Marc-René d'Espagnac (1752-94)

¹³ Oubliant la valeur symbolique des mots *chevaliers* et *czars*, les éditeurs des *Œuvres complètes* ont manqué de les mettre en italiques.

¹⁴ *Œuvres*, éd. Moland, XL, 156.

ZUR BEDEUTUNG BATTEUX'S FÜR LENZ

Das bekannte und häufig übersetzte Werk von Charles Batteux, *Les beaux Arts réduits à un même Principe* (Paris 1746), stand in der Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts im Zentrum des Kampfes zwischen Feinden und Anhängern der klassizistischen Theorie des Dramas.¹ Gottsched, Lessing, Ramler hatten sich Batteux angeschlossen; Johann Adolf Schlegel hatte ihn übersetzt, jedoch in seinen Anmerkungen und beigefügten Abhandlungen scharf kritisiert,² während Hamann den Gedanken der "belle nature" offen ablehnte.³ Herder war bei der Besprechung der Schlegelschen Übersetzung des Werkes mit einem wütenden Angriff auf den französischen Ästhetiker herausgekommen (*Werke*, I, 87 ff.) und hatte Batteux's Grundidee als eine "belle Phrase" mit "schönen Vieldeutigkeiten, über die sich schon schwatzen lässt" gebrandmarkt. Lenz hatte sich in seinen *Anmerkungen übers Theater* den Gegnern Batteux's angeschlossen.

Der wahre Dichter verbindet nicht in seiner Einbildungskraft, wie es ihm gefällt, was die Herren die schöne Natur zu nennen belieben, was aber, mit ihrer Erlaubnis, nichts als die verfehlt Natur ist (*Werke*, ed. Blei, I, 230).

Dieselbe ablehnende Haltung hatte Lenz ein Jahr später im *Neuen Menoza* eingenommen, dessen letzte Szene die Theorie der schönen Natur aufs derbste verspottet (II, 322 ff.). Umso erstaunlicher ist die Tatsache, dass Lenz in seiner Selbstrezension des *Menoza* eine ganz andere Haltung zu dieser Theorie einnimmt (II, 329 ff.). Woher kommt dieser plötzliche Umschwung?

Aus verständlichen Gründen hatte der *Menoza* keine sehr freundliche Aufnahme erfahren und sein Dichter hatte sich manche scharfe Kritik gefallen lassen müssen.⁴ Fehlende Übereinstimmung mit der Wirklichkeit, Unwahrscheinlichkeit der Handlung, Übertreibungen etc. wurden Lenz vorgeworfen und derartiger Tadel musste ihn umso schwerer treffen, als sein ästhetisches Programm

¹ Vgl. zum Folgenden Manfred Schenker, *C. Batteux und seine Nachahmungstheorie in Deutschland*, Leipzig 1909.

² *Einschränkung der schönen Künste auf einen einzigen Grundsatz*

³ *Aesthetica in Nuce*, *Werke* II, 280 f. Vgl. auch Unger, *Hamann und die Aufklärung*, I, 254.

⁴ Vgl. darüber die Angaben von Blei in Lenz's *Werken* II, 481 f.

einen streng naturalistischen Charakter hatte (vgl. I, 231). Gerade dieser Wille zu einer sich eng an die Wirklichkeit anschliessenden Kunst hatte aber Lenz in ein Dilemma geführt, das stets die Folge eines übertriebenen Naturalismus ist. Selbst bei volliger Beschränkung auf das Mögliche kann sich die Dichtung nicht völlig der Gesetzmäßigkeit der Wirklichkeit anschliessen, da das bloss Alltägliche des künstlerischen Interesses entbehrt. Um interessant zu sein, muss sich auch die naturalistischste Kunst entweder an besonders typische oder an ganz aussergewöhnliche Fälle halten und hat somit ebenfalls eine selbstständige Gesetzmäßigkeit. Lenz war sich über dieses Paradoxon des Naturalismus offenbar nicht im Klaren gewesen, erst die Kritik an seinem Drama und die Notwendigkeit, es zu verteidigen, führte ihn zu der Einsicht, dass der Gedanke der "getreuen Nachahmung" der Natur mit dem Wesen der Dichtung nicht in Einklang steht. Der Fehler konnte nun entweder in dem Begriff der Natur oder in dem der Nachahmung liegen, und da Lenz an dem Gedanken der Nachahmung festhält, so war er gezwungen, die notwendig gewordene Einschränkung des Begriffs der Naturnachahmung durch Einschränkung des Naturbegriffs zu erreichen. Und indem er in diesem Sinne bei seiner Verteidigung vorgeht, kommt er unwillkürlich auf den Begriff der schönen Natur zurück:

Ich habe nur dem Grafen Camaleon ertragliche Farben geben wollen, um unser Auge nicht zu beleidigen Das ist es, was ich schöne Natur nenne, nicht Verzuckungen in willkürliche Traume, die nur der schon findet, der wachend glücklich zu sein verzweifeln muß (II, 331)

In diesen Worten liegt eine deutliche Anerkennung Batteux's. Dass auch das Böse im Drama seinen Platz hat, wollte auch Batteux nicht bestreiten; aber mit seinem Verweis auf die schöne Natur wollte er dem Bösen die unangenehmen, widerlichen Seiten nehmen. Lenz wie Batteux sind sich also jetzt darin einig, dass es Dinge in der Natur gibt, die in der Dichtung nicht nachgeahmt werden dürfen. Allerdings versucht Lenz, in dem negativen Teil des zweiten Satzes eine Scheidungslinie zwischen sich und Batteux zu ziehen, indem er das klassizistische Drama ausschliesst, auf das sich der Ausdruck "Verzuckungen in willkürliche Traume" bezieht. Lenz wendet sich scharf gegen jedes Übermass des Fiktiven in der Dichtung, ist sich aber mit Batteux in dem Grundgedanken einig, dass die Natur gewisse Veränderungen untergehen muss, bevor sie zur Nachahmung reif ist.

Wenn demgemäss Graf Camaleon, der Bosewicht des *Melioza*, durch Abmilderung seiner natürlichen Eigenschaften zur "schönen Natur" erhoben ist, so durfte allerdings nicht das Gleiche auf Donna Diana zutreffen. Dass sie keine alltägliche Figur ist, übersieht auch Lenz nicht, wenn er auch nur recht gewunden davon Kenntnis nimmt, dass sie "gewissen Herren zu rasen scheint." Die Erklärung dieser Abweichung vom Üblichen gibt er unter Berufung auf einen von ihm "unumstößlich angenommenen Grundsatz für theatralische Darstellung," und dieser Grundsatz ist, "zu dem Gewöhnlichen . . . eine Verstärkung, eine Erhöhung hinzuzutun, die uns die Alltagscharaktere im gemeinen Leben auf dem Theater anzuglich, interessant machen kann" (II, 331). Verstärkung und Erhöhung der Natur zum Zwecke der Erzeugung eines erhöhten Interesses ist also die Quintessenz von Lenzens Ausführungen, und damit findet er engsten Anschluss an Batteux:

Sur ce principe, il faut conclure que si les Arts sont imitateurs de la Nature, ce doit être une imitation sage & éclairée, qui ne la copie pas servilement; mais qui choisissant les objets & les traits, les présente avec toute la perfection dont ils sont susceptibles (*Les beaux Arts* . . ., S. 24).

Nicht wahlloses Kopieren der Natur fordert Batteux, sondern sorgsames Aussuchen und Zusammenstellen gewisser Züge, die in vervollkommneter Form wiedergegeben werden sollen. Das ist nichts anderes als Lenzens Begriff der Erhöhung und Verstärkung, der ja auch nur eine Vervollkommenung des Gewöhnlichen ist. Auch die Abstellung auf das Interesse findet sich bei Batteux, der die schöne Natur als diejenige definiert, "qui a le plus rapport avec . . . notre intérêt." (o. c., S. 79.)

So einleuchtend die Übereinstimmung zwischen Batteux und Lenz ist, so bedarf es doch kaum einer Betonung, dass hier keineswegs zwei gleichartige dramatische Theorien vorliegen. Batteux gehört zur Partei der "anciens," Lenz zu den "modernes," und als solcher war und blieb er der überzeugte Gegner der von Batteux vertretenen poetischen Richtung. Die Anlehnung an den früher geschmähten und bekämpften Franzosen war sicherlich nur ein Gebot der Verlegenheit, aber selbst dann bleibt es bezeichnend für dessen Bedeutung, dass Lenz, sobald seine eigenen Theorien nicht mehr ausreichen, zu jenem seine Zuflucht nimmt. Nicht umsonst hatte Lessing die Arbeit des Herrn Batteux als "glücklich" bezeichnet (*Werke*, ed. Lachmann, Muncker, IV, 413 ff.). Hamann und Herder mochten Batteux noch so sehr angreifen,

eine wirkliche Loslösung von ihm war erst möglich, als die Theorie der Nachahmung allgemein überwunden war.

In Anbetracht dieser bedeutenden Stellung Batteux's ist es nicht weiter verwunderlich, dass sich auch in den *Anmerkungen übers Theater* gewisse Spuren seines Geistes finden. Dass Lenz Batteux zum Zeugen für das Prinzip der Nachahmung anruft, dürfte wohl hauptsächlich ironisch gemeint sein, jedoch finden sich in der Schrift einige Gedanken, die von Batteux beeinflusst sein dürften.⁵

Als einer der eigenartigsten Züge der *Anmerkungen* haben seit jeher Lenzens Ausführungen über Charaktere und Begebenheiten in der Tragödie und Komödie gegolten während fast alle Theoretiker der Tragödie Handlung, der Komödie aber im Anschluss an Molière Charaktere als Hauptwesensmerkmal zuschrieben, dreht Lenz diesen Satz um und verlangt Charaktere für die Tragödie und Handlung für die Komödie. Dass es sich dabei um ein "Produkt der Laune . . . einen witzigen Einfall" handelt, wie Friedrich (o. c., S. 64) behauptet, scheint mehr als zweifelhaft, wenn man bedenkt, dass Lenz als Dichter bei seinen eigenen Werken die Konsequenz aus dieser Theorie gezogen und sowohl den *Hofmeister* wie die *Soldaten* als Komödie bezeichnet hat. Spuren dieser eigenartigen Umkehrung finden sich nun auch bei Batteux. Tragödie ist ihm "représentation de grands hommes" (o. c., S. 213), und in diesem Sinne legt er bei seiner weiteren Auseinandersetzung Hauptgewicht stets auf die Helden (Héros) wie Brutus, Cassius etc. Die Komödie definiert Batteux dagegen als eine "action feinte, dans laquelle on représente le ridicule. . ." Als ihren Gegenstand bezeichnet er "la vie civile," "on y voit ce qu'on voit dans le monde" (o. c., S. 219 f). Auffällig an dieser Begriffsbestimmung ist die Auslassung des Wortes Charakter. Zwar erkennt Batteux die Bedeutung der Charaktere für die Komödie durchaus an, denn er erklärt das Lächerliche aus diesen, doch ist diese Verbindung nur mittelbar und bedeutet eine erhebliche Abweichung von den gewöhnlichen Theorien. Komödie ist nach Batteux in erster Linie Handlung, die dann allerdings zur Erzeugung des Komischen der Charaktere bedarf. Das Verfahren des Dichters ist also das folgende: "Il crée une Action, des Acteurs, il les multiplie selon ses besoins . . ." (o. c., S. 119). Demgegenüber

⁵ Friedrich, Theodor (Die "*Anmerkungen übers Theater*," Leipzig 1908, S. 42) vermutet—wohl mit Recht—einen Einfluss Batteux's in der flüchtig angedeuteten Scheidung zwischen Poesie der Sachen und des Stils

Lenz: "In der Komodie aber gehe ich von den Handlungen⁵ aus und lasse Personen teil dran nehmen, welche ich will." Bei der Tragodie hingegen erwecken die alten Helden unser grosstes Interesse und ganz wie Batteux denkt auch Lenz in erster Linie an die grossen Helden aus der Antike, die der Dichter wieder lebendig macht (*o. c.*, S. 253 f.). Es bedarf auch hier keiner besonderen Betonung, dass Batteux wieder an die Klassizisten denkt, während Lenzens Ideen vor allen auf Shakespeare hinielen. Trotzdem durfte diese Ubereinstimmung kein Zufall sein; es ist charakteristisch, dass Lenz bei der Anfuhrung von Shakespearschen Tragodien zuerst an die Romerdramen denkt, die ausserlich die grösste Ähnlichkeit mit dem Klassizismus aufweisen.

Noch eine weitere bedeutsame Ubereinstimmung sei hier angefuhr. Lenzens Gleichsetzung der Einheit des Ortes mit der Einheit des Chores (I, 239) ist, wie Friedrich richtig ausfuhrt (*o. c.*, S. 38), hauptsachlich auf Lessings Hamburgische Dramaturgie (46. Stuck) zuruckzufuhren, doch ist es falsch zu behaupten, dass diese an sich vollig unverständliche Gleichsetzung . . . ihre Erklärung erst durch Lessings Worte erhalte, denn dieser Gedanke war schon von andern Ästhetikern vorgetragen worden: Home⁶ sowohl wie D'Aubignac⁷ hatten darauf hingewiesen, und ferner auch Batteux (*o. c.*, S. 217), Lenzens Ausführungen über diesen Punkt lauten:

Einheit des Orts—oder möchten wir lieber sagen, Einheit des Chors, denn was war es anders? Kommen doch auf dem griechischen Theater die Leute wie gerufen herbei, und kein Mensch stösst sich daran. Weil wir uns freuen, dass sie nur da sind—weil das Chor dafür da steht, daß sie kommen sollen, und sich das im Kopf eines Freundes geschwind zusammenreimt, was wohl die *causa prima* und *remotior* der Ankunft seines Freundes sein mochte, wenn er ihn eben in seinen Armen drückt (I, 239)

Der erste Satz stützt sich deutlich auf Lessing, der gerade darauf hingewiesen hatte, dass die Einheit des Ortes nur eine notwendige Folge der Verwendung des Chores sei. Die folgenden Satze dagegen, die sich mit dem Chor als motivierendem Element abgeben, haben mit Lessing nichts zu tun, der dieses Problem noch nicht einmal berührt, sondern sich streng an die Frage der Einheit halt. Lenz sieht dagegen in dem Chor nicht nur eine Erklärung der Einheit des Ortes, sondern er gilt ihm auch als das Element, das die

⁵ *Elements of Criticism*, Edinburgh 1762, III, 270 ff

⁷ *Pratique du Théâtre*, Amsterdam 1715, S 87, 109 f.

griechische Tragödie überhaupt zusammenhält und die Verbindung zwischen ihren einzelnen Teilen und Motiven herstellt. Einen ganz parallelen Gedanken bringt Batteux zum Ausdruck, wenn er sagt:

Le chant lyrique du Chœur exprimoit dans les Entractes les mouvemens excités par l'Acte qui venoit de finir Le Spectateur ému en prenoit aisément l'unisson, & se préparoit ainsi à recevoir l'impression des Actes suivans (o c, S 217)

Wenn man bedenkt, wie bekannt gerade Batteux im Vergleich zu Home und D'Aubignac in Deutschland war, so wird es mehr als wahrscheinlich, dass es sich hier tatsächlich um eine Anlehnung an den ersteren handelt. So sehr Batteux gerade als ein Vertreter sogenannter französischer Oberflächlichkeit angegriffen wurde, so war seine Bedeutung damals viel zu gross, als dass sich die deutsche Ästhetik von ihm hatte befreien können.

HANS M. WOLFF

The University of Texas

FRIEDRICH SCHLEGELS *ALARCOS* UND DIE UMBILDUNG DER FRUEHROMANTIK

Alles, was für Friedrich Schlegels einziges Drama, den *Alarcos*,¹ bis heute geschehen ist, ist eine Untersuchung seiner Quellen und eine recht unbefriedigende Darstellung seines romantischen Charakters.² Dass die Dinge komplizierter liegen und die Begriffe "romantisch" und "antik" in keiner Weise ausreichen, die innere wie die äussere Struktur des Werkes aufzudecken, und dass vor

¹ Geschrieben 1801, gedruckt 1802 — Ich zitiere nach dem Text im 9. Bd. der *Sämtlichen Werke* von 1846

² Den romantischen Charakter hat vor allem Bastiaan Machiel Blok, *Romantisches in F. Schlegels Trauerspiel "Alarcos," Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Frühromantik*, Diss. Groningen, 1931, untersucht. Walzel (*Deutsche National-Litteratur*, Bd. 143, Seite XLVII) sieht das Romantische des *Alarcos* in der Nachahmung des Calderon eine völlig unhaltbare Vereinfachung des Problems! — Für die Quellen des *Alarcos* Egidio Gorra, *Fra drammi e poemi*, Milano 1900. Darin Una Romanza Spagnuola nella poesia e nel teatro L'*Alarcos* di Federico Schlegel, pp. 1-106, besonders pp. 43-88) — Allen W. Porterfield, "The *Alarcos* Theme in German and English," in *The Germanic Review*, VI, April 1931, Nr. 2, pp. 125-143

allein die Frage nach den Quellen in diesem Falle besonders unfruchtbar ist, ist bisher nicht gesehen worden

Wie die *Lucinde* die berliner Periode Schlegels künstlerisch zusammenfasst und abschliesst, so ist der *Alarcos* die Zusammenfassung und der Abschluss der jenaer Zeit. Die Entwicklung seiner Kunst und seines Denkens von der *Lucinde* bis zum *Alarcos* ist die Entwicklung des berliner zum jenaer Schlegel. Und doch liegen zwischen den beiden Werken nur zwei Jahre, zwei Jahre langsamer aber ständiger innerer Wandlung, Jahre des Unbefriedigtseins mit dem Erreichten und des Suchens nach neuen Wegen und Mitteln.

Wenn wir die *Lucinde* mit dem *Alarcos* vergleichen, so stossen wir zunächst auf eine offensichtliche Wesensähnlichkeit, die nicht ohne Bedeutung ist: den subjektiven Charakter beider Werke. Während aber in der *Lucinde* der subjektivistisch erarbeitete Gegenstand das Ich des Dichters selbst gewesen war, wurde im *Alarcos* die Subjektivität durch einen von aussen herangetragenen Stoff ins Objektive gemildert. Diese Verlegung der dichterischen Ebene in die Aussenwelt der Geschichte, dieses Suchen nach einer Hülle, einer Form, in die sich die im Innern erlebten Gehalte giessen liessen, diese Flucht vor dem absoluten Ich ist der Beginn jenes Weges, den der gewandelte Schlegel in der zweiten Hälfte seines Lebens zu Ende gehen sollte.

So weit sie für das Verständnis des Werkes wichtig sind, kennen wir die Quellen des *Alarcos* recht genau. Wir wissen, dass Schlegel seinen Stoff in einer spanischen Romanze gefunden hat,³ der er in der Entwicklung der Handlung und der Charaktere Schritt für Schritt und beinahe ohne jede selbständige Modifikation gefolgt ist. Ob er diese Romanze im spanischen Original oder in der als wortgetreu anerkannten Nachdichtung Bertuchs⁴ kennen gelernt

³ Vergleiche hierzu die ausführlichen Untersuchungen Gorras und Bloks. Blok hat augenscheinlich die Arbeit Gorras nicht gekannt, sodass wesentliche Teile seiner Arbeit Wiederholungen sind.

⁴ H C F Bertuch, Theater der Spanier und Portugiesen, Dessau und Leipzig 1782, Seite 102 — Jedenfalls war es nicht das Drama Rambachs, das Schlegel als Unterlage gedient hat, wie noch Gundolf (*Romantiker*, Berlin-Wilmersdorf 1930, Seite 133) irrtümlich annimmt — Porterfield, der weder Gorra noch Blok zu kennen scheint, glaubt, Schlegel habe die Ballade im spanischen Original kennen gelernt. Bei der Begründung, Schlegel habe sich seit früher Jugend für das Spanische interessiert, übersieht er, dass dieses Interesse nur sehr oberflächlich gewesen sein kann,

hat, ist dabei völlig belanglos. Der Stoff war deswegen so glücklich gewählt, weil er die zu entwickelnden Ideen gleichsam schon im Keime enthielt, sodass Schlegel, dessen Phantasie ohnehin nicht die stärkste Seite seiner Begabung war,⁵ nichts Wesentliches von sich aus in die Materie hineinzuprojizieren hatte.

Eine Deutung des *Alarcos* wird nun aber durch verschiedene Faktoren wesentlich kompliziert, in erster Linie durch die Tatsache, dass wir von Schlegel selbst aus der Zeit seiner *Alarcos*-Dichtung keine Äusserungen von irgendwelcher Tragweite über seine dramatischen und gedanklichen Intentionen besitzen. Auf der anderen Seite ist es unmöglich, die ästhetischen, kritischen und philosophischen Äusserungen der Schlegelschen Frühzeit—namentlich die *Fragmente*—zur Deutung des *Alarcos* bedenkenlos heranzuziehen. Gerade das aber ist bisher noch immer geschehen, wo der *Alarcos* zur Diskussion stand.⁶ Es ist damit übersehen worden, dass die Bedeutung dieses Dramas für die Entwicklung Schlegels gerade in der indirekten, künstlerischen Überwindung der *Atheneums*-Periode besteht.

Das einzig sichere Hilfsmittel, an den *Alarcos* heranzukommen, ist daher der *Alarcos* selbst. Der Hintergrund dieser Dichtung war das mittelalterliche Spanien, das "romantische" Spanien, wesensmassig ein Teil jener mittelalterlich-universalen Welt, die die Dichtung der Frühromantik—allen voran die Dichtung Tiecks—neu entdeckt und fruchtbar zu machen begonnen hatte, wenn man von allen Vorläufern in der populären Literatur—wie gerade Bertuch—absehen will. Dass dieses Spanien katholisch war, war zunächst nur ein äusserlicher Wesenszug der historischen Kulisse. Die intensiv katholische Frömmigkeit, die das Drama durchzieht,

da er seine intime Kenntnis des Spanischen erst der Vermittlung Tiecks verdankte. Abgesehen ferner davon, dass Porterfield den Satz in Walzels Briefausgabe (*Friedrich Schlegels Briefe an seinen Bruder August Wilhelm*, Berlin 1890, Seite 6), in dem Friedrich "um die Romanze im spanischen Geschmack" bittet, nicht richtig deutet (vergl. Walzels Fussnote dazu'), ist seine Konjektur schon durch Gorra und Blok überholt. Ausserdem erkennt gerade Porterfield die Bertuchsche Übersetzung, trotz einiger Fehler, als recht wortgetreu an, sodass jede weitere Spekulation überflüssig ist.

⁵ Schon Körner schrieb am 9 Juni 1802 an Schiller "Man sieht das peinliche Streben, bei gänzlichem Mangel an Phantasie, aus allgemeinen Begriffen ein Kunstwerk hervorzubringen."

⁶ Dies tut vor allem Blok

war damit gleichsam als Farbung des Stoffes gegeben—und doch war gerade sie nicht gleichgültig für Schlegels unmittelbare Intentionen. Es ist nicht zu verkennen, dass Schlegels unbeholfene, nicht selten holpernde Sprache gerade in solchen Augenblicken hinreissend und beredt wird, in denen es sich um den dichterischen Ausdruck des religiösen Erlebens handelt.⁷ Das katholische Gewand, das auf den ersten Blick nur ein Stilmittel zu sein scheint, ist in Wirklichkeit die Sache selbst, ein unmittelbarer Gegenstand. Der unbedingte Glaube an die göttliche Gerechtigkeit und die dem frühen Schlegel so fremde Erkenntnis, dass die Leidenschaft die wahre Triebfeder des Unglücks und der Sünde ist; das latente Schuldbewusstsein und dessen Sublimierung in Frommigkeit und Milde; die vorausgesehene Strafe des Inferno für den Sunder (worin zweifellos ein Nachklingen der unter August Wilhelms Anleitung vorgenommenen Dante-Lektüre zu sehen ist) und das Erscheinen der Reinen vor dem Thron Gottes, an das sich die Idee der Fursprache für den unschuldigen Sunder knüpft—all dies ist mehr als Kolorit, es ist die Grundlage dieses im gewöhnlichen Sinne des Wortes so undramatischen Dramas.⁸

Die dramatische Spannung liegt daher auch nicht zwischen den handelnden Personen, die mehr gehandelt werden als dass sie handeln, sondern zwischen zwei Welten, der göttlich-vollkommenen und der menschlich-unvollkommenen.⁹ Die beiden Gruppen dramatischer Gegenspieler—der König und die Infantin einerseits und Donna Clara und Alarcos andererseits—sind nur scheinbare Opponenten, der wahre Bruch geht mitten durch ihre Reihen, er spiegelt sich am sichtbarsten in der Doppelschichtigkeit ihres Bewusstseins, der Verbindung einfach menschlichen Wissens (Ehre- und Liebe-Motive!) mit einer tiefer führenden aussermenschlichen Ahnung, die jede Handlung dieser Figuren begleitet oder ihr vorausgeht.

Bezeichnend aber ist nun, dass dieser innere Bruch nichts, oder doch nur sehr Äusserliches, mit der romantischen Ironie gemein

⁷ Z. B. *Werke*, IX, Seite 236.

⁸ Bloks Behauptung (a. a. O. Seite 44), Schlegel habe "das spezifisch katholische Element in der Hauptsache fallen lassen," ist erstaunlich und kann nicht deutlich genug zurückgewiesen werden.

⁹ Siehe hierzu auch Gorra (a. a. O. Seite 83). Dies mag Porterfield zu dem befremdlichen und nicht weiter begründeten Schluss geführt haben, der *Alarcos* sei ein Schicksalsdrama (a. a. O. Seite 138).

hat, Und auch der Witz, dieses unentbehrliche Element frühromantischer Dichtung, ist auf sprechende Weise dem *Alarcos* fremd. Beide—Witz und Ironie—haben sich zu dem vollkommenen Gegensatz von Ahnung und Wissen, Realität und Superrealität, Religio und Irreligio gesteigert, in dem die menschliche Freiheit zur völligen Unfreiheit wird. Der tragische Bruch, der in der berliner Periode der Frühromantik noch durch Ironie verschleiert und dadurch scheinbar aufgehoben worden war, wird damit in eine aussermenschliche Sphäre verlegt, in der er notwendig zu einer Auseinandersetzung mit den letzten Dingen werden musste.

Eine solche Dramatik aber musste die Logik des Handlungsaufbaus und jedes Streben nach psychologischer Wahrscheinlichkeit durch ein alles auflösendes Gefühl ersetzen. Die Ahnung wird zum treibenden Element der Handlung¹⁰ In allen Schattierungen bestimmt sie das Verhalten der Helden, von der blossen Sentimentalität über Ängste und Befürchtungen bis zu weissagender Ekstase und prophetischem Wahnsinn.

Die einzige, wirklich gültige Parallele solcher Dramatik finden wir in der jüngsten deutschen Literatur. Erst das expressionistische Drama hat wieder versucht, die dramatische Spannung zwischen zwei gegensätzliche Lebenssphären zu legen, zwischen denen die Helden mit einer scheinbar sinnlos gewordenen Planlosigkeit handeln. Erst hier haben wir wieder ein Drama, das, wie der *Alarcos*, nicht in aufsteigender und wieder abfallender Linie, sondern in gerade aufsteigender und sich im Endlosen verlaufender Richtung bewegt. Vor allem das Ende des *Alarcos*, mit seiner völligen Überwindung des Irdischen und der Etablierung einer paradiesartig versöhnten Klosteridylle, ist wie ein unmittelbarer Vorläufer expressionistischen Theaters.¹¹

Diese Auflösung des Dramatischen ist nun fraglos tief in der seelischen und geistigen Struktur der Frühromantik begründet. Romantisch sind die Figuren des Stückes in ihrer Verwischung der Grenzen zwischen Göttlichem und Menschlichem einerseits

¹⁰ Schon Blok hat die Bedeutung der Ahnung im *Alarcos* richtig erkannt (vor allem a. a. O. Seite 117). Sein Hinweis auf Böhme aber, dem Schlegel z. B. den Sternenglauben entlehnt habe, ist deswegen überflüssig, weil es sich hier um altes dramatisches Gut handelt (cf. Schillers *Wallenstein*).

¹¹ Siehe hierzu Wolfgang Paulsen, *Expressionismus und Aktivismus*, Eine typologische Untersuchung, Bern 1935, pp. 166 ff.

und zwischen Männlichem und Weiblichem andererseits.¹² Romantisch ist die Spielerei mit Formen, Versmassen und Rhythmen, die mosaikartig und ohne Bezug auf den Inhalt aneinandergesetzt werden, deren Leichtigkeit sich aber an der Schwerfälligkeit und dem Pathos der Gegenstände bricht.

Doch schon bei der Betrachtung der Form wird es deutlich, dass hier nicht nur romantische Prinzipien wirksam gewesen sind. Romantisch—das war ja für den jungen Schlegel die Verbindung des Antiken mit dem Modernen, des Natürlichen mit dem Interessanten gewesen. Schlegel, der zur Moderne erst über die Antike und nicht zuletzt durch das lebende Vorbild Goethes gekommen war, hatte zur Zeit der Abfassung des *Alarcos* die Antike mit modernen—mit Goethes Augen sehen gelernt. Das Bild der Antike ist durch die Verbindung mit dem Romantisch-Modernen aber in einer Weise verschoben worden, die es für Schlegel in eine theoretische Ferne ruckte und der ursprünglichen Erlebnisfähigkeit mehr und mehr beraubte. Das, was an Antikem im *Alarcos* vorhanden ist, ist in Wahrheit nur noch dessen Skelett, die Verflüchtigung in die abstrakte Form des traditionellen Klassizismus.

In den gesammelten Werken Schlegels vom Jahre 1846 findet sich nun, unmittelbar anschliessend an den *Alarcos*, ein höchst aufschlussreiches Produkt, das auch auf den *Alarcos* einige nicht unwichtige Rückschlüsse erlaubt: eine metrische Nachdichtung des ersten Aktes von Racines *Bayazet*.¹³ Wenn man den *Alarcos* mit diesem Nachdichtungsversuch zusammenhält, erkennt man, woher Schlegel die antiken Elemente seiner Dichtung in Wirklichkeit bezogen hat, obwohl man—gerade wegen des vorherrschenden Ehrbegriffs im *Alarcos*—das indirekte Vorbild eher in Corneille als in Racine suchen mochte. Das klassizistische Theater jedenfalls, das Schlegel seit seiner frühesten Jugend gekannt haben muss, bot sich dem ohnehin im Schweisse seines Angesichts dichtenden Dichter eher an, als das nur noch intellektuell erkannte Prinzip der antiken Tragödie, und musste sich daher—bewusst oder unbewusst—im *Alarcos* durchsetzen. So sind denn auch die

¹² Über die Verschmelzung des Männlichen mit dem Weiblichen im *Alarcos* siehe Blok, a. a. O., pp. 66 ff.

¹³ Zuerst veröffentlicht im ersten Stück des zweiten Bandes der *Europa*, 1803. Ich setze sie unbedenklich für die unmittelbar auf den *Alarcos* folgende Pariser Zeit an.

Figuren dieses Dramas die herkömmlichen Typen—der Bosewicht, der Hofling, die Intrigantin, das liebende Weib, der treue Diener, der unschuldige Held usw.—Marionetten, die am Drahte der von ihr verkörperten Bedeutung agieren.¹⁴ Klassizistisch—im epigonalen Sinne des Wortes—ist der deklamatorische Ton der Dialogführung, die herkömmliche Metaphorik, wie der vollige Verzicht auf psychologische Begründung, der eine eintonige Schwarz-Weiss-Zeichnung zur Folge hat. Klassizistisch nicht zuletzt ist der ganz casuistische Ehrbegriff, der die aussere Handlung in Gang halten soll.¹⁵ Der Aufbau des Stücker in zwei Akten (anstatt in fünf) ist dabei wohl der dramatischen Kurzatmigkeit des Dichters zuzuschreiben und ohne jede weitere Konsequenz.¹⁶

Diese dichterische Kurzartmigkeit Schlegels lässt sich aber nicht nur im Gesamtaufbau des Dramas erkennen. Es ist auffallend einen wie geringen ursprünglichen Sinn Friedrich Schlegel—im Gegensatz zu seinem Bruder August Wilhelm—für Sprache und Sprachmelodik besass.¹⁷ Dieser Mangel ist es, der für die offensichtliche Schwerfälligkeit des Stils, die Ungelenkheit der "gepoterten,"¹⁸ Verse, die unnatürliche, des Reims und der Versmasse wegen verdrehte und gedrechselte Sprache verantwortlich gemacht werden muss. Die billige Sentenzenhaftigkeit, die damit unterläuft, mag sich noch unmittelbar auf die Formulierungswut

¹⁴ Gundolf (a a O, Seite 133) "Die Figuren . . . sind nicht einmal Typen, sondern lediglich Mundstücke, Automaten . . ."

¹⁵ Es ist bezeichnend, dass dieser Ehrbegriff in der Vorlage, der spanischen Romanze, eine untergeordnete Rolle spielt (cf Porterfield, a a O, Seite 137) Blok (a a O, vor allem Seite 18) geht in seiner Deutung des Stücker fast ausschliesslich von diesem Ehrbegriff aus, und Gorra glaubt aus demselben Grund—in Anschluss an die Kritik des *Apollon* (*Apollon*, Eine Zeitschrift, Penig 1803, pp. 32-50, 106-123, 248-270)—im *Alarcos* ein Ideendrama sehen zu müssen. Die Idee der Ehre und des Gehorsams soll demzufolge über die der Liebe und Ehe triumphieren. Gorra übersieht aber die religiöse Implikation, die eine Wiederherstellung der einmal verletzten Ehre nur im Jenseits zulässt. Die Auffassung des *Alarcos* als Ideendrama scheint mir deswegen nicht haltbar zu sein.

¹⁶ Porterfield (a a O, Seite 137) "That the play is divided into two acts instead of five is merely accidental there are five distinct climaxes or breaks in the development nevertheless" Ich kann das nicht sehen.

¹⁷ Schon Körner schreibt in dem zitierten Brief an Schiller (Anm 5) "Für den eigentlichen Wohlklang der Verse muss er gar kein Ohr haben"

¹⁸ Rudolf Haym, *Die romantische Schule*, 4. Aufl. (Hgg von O. Walzel) Berlin 1920, Seite 732.

des Fragmentisten zurückfuhren lassen, indirekt gerechtfertigt aber war auch sie durch das Vorbild des dem französischen Klassizismus verschuldeten aufklärerischen Theaters, das Schlegel sicher nicht erst in Berlin kennen lernte. So hat der jahrelange Kampf mit Schiller seine anachionistischen Früchte getragen, denn diese Schlegelsche Dramatik geht weit hinter das Schillersche Drama zurück.

Ganz ähnlich aber verhält es sich auch mit der romantischen Idee des *Alarcos*, dem ihm zugrunde liegenden Freiheitsbegriff. Auch hier handelt es sich nicht einfach um eine ins Künstlerische gewendete Verwirklichung frühromantischer Anschauungen. Eine genauere Analyse des Inhaltes würde zeigen, dass die Handlungsweise des Helden weit davon entfernt ist, einen weltenschöpferrischen, ich-bewussten Freiheitsvorbehalt vorauszusetzen. Nur auf den ersten Blick scheint es, als ob der Selbstmord des Alarcos die Tat eines Mannes wäre, der sich sein Schicksal selbst wählt, für den der Entschluss zur Selbstvernichtung ein selbstgewählter Entschluss ist, ein Sieg über die Unfreiheit der Materie. Dieser Freiheitsvorbehalt ist deswegen so wenig überzeugend, weil er schon in dem Augenblick ins Auge gefasst wird, in dem der dramatische Konflikt erst beginnt, sodass die irdisch-aktiven Freiheitsmöglichkeiten in keiner Weise erschöpft sind. Die freie Handlung des Alarcos ist so unlosbar verwoben mit dem Bewusstsein der Sünde, dass der schliessliche Untergang als eine gottliche Bestrafung und nicht als freie Wahl erscheint. Alarcos, so konnte man geradezu sagen, macht sich im Verlaufe des Dramas nicht "frei zu etwas" sondern lediglich "frei von etwas"—wobei dieses "etwas" nichts anderes ist als die von Schlegel bisher idealistisch aufgefasste Welt. Was sich hinter der Freiheit des Alarcos wirklich verbirgt, wird von ihm in zwei charakteristischen Versen deutlich genug ausgesprochen:

Uns Lebendigen ward vom Himmel Tröstung noch ertheilt,
Dass zurück zum Paradiese Freiheit tapfer eilt!¹⁹

Es ist nicht Freiheit, sondern himmlische Tröstung, der die Helden ihr Ich aufopfern, ohne dieser Tröstung jedoch schon wirklich sicher zu sein. Gerade im Verhalten des Alarcos kommt diese innerste Unsicherheit in der entscheidenden Szene, der Sterbeszene, deutlich zum Ausdruck. In dem Augenblick nämlich, als

¹⁹ *Werke*², IX, Seite 236.

die 'Brucken hinter Alarcos—und seinem Dichter—abgebrochen sind, als die Konsequenzen der Freiheitszerstörung in ihrer ganzen Grosse vor ihm stehen, ist er der ersehnten Sicherheiten am wenigsten sicher. Das ganz unheroische Zaudern, das Auf- und Abwogen der Gefühle und das schliessliche Ermatten nach einem letzten Sich-Auflehnen verrät die tiefe Verwirrung des Helden und seines Dichters.

Schlegel hat mit dem *Alarcos* wirklich zum ersten Mal entscheidend hinter das Ich zurückgegriffen. Die Freiheit, die Alarcos und Donna Clara im Auge haben, ist nicht mehr die Freiheit Fichtes, sondern eine "himmlische Freiheit" in der "im Tod ich zum Leben gesunde."²⁰ Die problematisch gewordene Subjektivität ist damit in eine nur durch Verzicht und Überwindung zu erzielende Problemlosigkeit umgebogen worden, die für das Werk des späten Schlegel so charakteristisch werden sollte.

An dieser Stelle aber wird es auch wieder deutlich, dass das versteckte Zurückgreifen auf die Form des Klassizismus und die Aufgabe des frühromantischen Freiheitsideals, wie sie im *Alarcos* zum Ausdruck kommen, keine Widersprüche sind. Beidemale ist es das Suchen nach objektiv ästhetischer und philosophischer Form, nach einem Halt ausserhalb des Individuums.

In dieser Hinsicht ist der *Alarcos* aber wieder ebenso autobiographisch wie sein Gegenstück, die *Lucinde*. Beide Werke sind die Produkte geistiger Krisen ihres Dichters, Abrechnungen und Wandlungen, Vorstösse in geistiges Neuland, denen die intellektuelle Fundamentierung erst nachfolgen musste. Bis ins einzelne lässt sich der verborgene autobiographische Charakter dieser Werke nachzeichnen. So haben alle Figuren im *Alarcos* etwas von ihrem Dichter, die Gegenspieler das, was er in sich zu überwinden hatte—die eigentlichen Helden das Suchen nach neuer Form und neuen Inhalten.

So ist der *Alarcos* ein frühes, nicht unwichtiges Dokument für den Umbau frühromantischer Geistesformen in Friedrich Schlegel. Es ist der Beginn jenes Weges "hinauf zum Licht," der von der neugewonnenen Erkenntnis ausgeht, dass "die schlimmste Krankheit dieser Erd ist Tand und Traum."²¹

WOLFGANG PAULSEN

*Southwestern College,
Memphis, Tennessee*

²⁰ *Werke*², IX, Seite 227

²¹ *Werke*², IX, Seite 236

LAHONTAN AND CRITICAL DEISM

Among the deistic treatises discussed by Mr. Ira O. Wade in his splendid study, *The Clandestine Organization and Diffusion of Philosophic Ideas in France from 1700 to 1750* (Princeton University Press, 1938), is a work entitled *Dissertation et preuve de l'éternité du monde*. The author of this unpublished work in his attempt to discredit the orthodox views on the age of the world first takes the historical approach. To support his contention of the extreme antiquity of the world, he cites the annals of the Chaldeans, the Egyptians, the Persians, the Chinese, and the Siamese (Wade, *op. cit.*, pp. 244, 245). This method of attack, it may be added, had been commonly employed either to show the unknowability of the earth's age or to prove its extreme antiquity by early sceptics and deistic writers. To mention a few: Montaigne, La Mothe le Vayer, Gassendi, Gabriel Foigny, Denis Veiras, the *Espion Turc*, Lord Herbert of Cherbury, and Charles Blount.

However, the author of the *Dissertation et preuve de l'éternité du monde* also brings forth the "Canadiens" in support of his contention. "ils disent qu'il faut être fou pour croire qu'un Etre si puissant soit demeuré dans l'inaction pendant toute l'éternité, et qu'il ne se soit avisé de produire des créatures que depuis cinq à six mille ans" (Wade, *loc. cit.*).

None of the early sceptics or deistic writers of the seventeenth century had cited the "Canadiens" in support of their argument. What then, it may be asked, was the source used by this most unoriginal author? It can be shown, I believe, that the passage was a quotation taken word for word from the *Mémoires de l'Amérique septentrionale* by the baron de Lahontan (ed. G. Chinard, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1931). Lahontan, a Cartesian and a deist, published his account of the customs and beliefs of the North American savages in 1703.¹ In a chapter on their religious views, he points out that the "sauvages" ridicule the story of creation on the following rational grounds: "Qu'il faut être fou pour croire qu'un Etre tout-puissant soit demeuré dans

¹From internal evidence Mr. Wade concluded that the treatise was written after January 9, 1701 (*op. cit.*, p. 245). Since Lahontan's work is of 1703, it seems that the date of composition of the *Dissertation et preuve de l'éternité du monde* must be advanced to 1703 or later.

l'inaction pendant toute une éternité & qu'il ne se soit pas avisé de produire des Créatures, que depuis cinq ou six mille ans" (*op. cit.*, pp. 108, 109). It is evident that the passages are identical. In view of the fact that Lahontan's work is exclusively concerned with the savages of Canada, it seems more probable that Lahontan supplied the ammunition to his anonymous deist countryman than that the contrary should be true.

This borrowing attests once more the influence of Lahontan on critical authors of the eighteenth century, and it confirms in an interesting way the close relationship between published and unpublished works at an early date in the development of critical deism.

Wesleyan University

DAVID RICE MCKEE

AN ATTACK ON JOHN FIELDING

In July, 1758, the bookseller John Scott published an anonymous pamphlet entitled *Jonathan Wild's Advice to his Successors . . . To [which] . . . is annex'd a Plan and Proposals for an Hospital, or Public Asylum, for decay'd and Infirm Thief-Takers. . .*¹ The nature and purpose of this shilling squib have never been noticed by biographers of the Fieldings. It is an attack aimed at John Fielding, Henry Fielding's blind half-brother, who succeeded Henry as magistrate of the Bow Street court and as *ex officio* director of London's first effective constabulary. The pamphlet, doubtless provoked by the appearance in February, 1758, of John Fielding's self-congratulatory *Account of the Origin and Effects of a Police set on Foot by his Grace the Duke of Newcastle in the Year 1753, upon a Plan presented . . . by the late Henry Fielding*,² purports to be a valedictory letter from the famous thief-taker Jonathan Wild, written in 1725 shortly before he was hanged. He addresses it to anyone who "may think it worth his while to revive my Occupation . . . , it being a Function of no small Profit, requiring very little Industry, Honour, Honesty, or Conscience."³

¹ *London Magazine*, xxvii, 374. A copy of this pamphlet is in the Fielding Collection of the Yale University Library.

² See R. Leslie-Melville, *The Life and Works of Sir John Fielding*, London, 1934, p. 85.

³ *Jonathan Wild's Advice*, p. 2.

The consummate thief-taker is shown to be the one who carries on a lucrative traffic in stolen goods and rewards, while pretending to be a servant of the public. The accusation implied was a common one, both John and Henry Fielding had faced it before.⁴

Unmistakable reference to the blind John Fielding is to be found in two further passages. The first is a bit of advice: "But if, by any Misfortune, you should be deprived of the Blessings of Sight, be careful in the Choice of a good Physiognomist."⁵ The second refers to the presence in court of professional swearers, persons who for a fee were willing to swear to the truth of any statement offered as evidence: "This is a plain Proof how blind Justice is, though it was not meant by the Emblem that she should be blind to Truth, but blind to Partiality."⁶

The ironical fact which the pamphleteer suggests is that John Fielding, Justice of the Peace for Westminster and Middlesex, is really the natural heir of the notorious thief and thief-taker Jonathan Wild. From about 1715 to 1725 Jonathan Wild, posing as a zealous enforcer of the law, had made it his business to apprehend and impeach all thieves who refused to rob for him and to accept his terms of payment. Independent operators and rebellious members of Wild's own gang suffered alike.⁷ The careers of Wild and other less noted thief-takers created a general distrust of all officers of the law. The Bow Street Runners, organized by Henry Fielding and commanded by Saunders Welch, were an honest and incorruptible company of citizens, interested only in suppressing crime. It was a long time, however, before the general public could be convinced that they were not heartless and self-interested thief-takers. Capitalizing on this general suspicion is the chief technique found in *Jonathan Wild's Advice to his Successors*. To make the attack more pointed, the public memory of Jonathan Wild had recently been refreshed by a new edition of Henry Fielding's *Life of Mr. Jonathan Wild the Great*.⁸

⁴ See W. L. Cross, *The History of Henry Fielding*, New Haven, 1918, III, 114.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 8.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 17.

⁷ See Daniel Defoe, *A True and Genuine Account of the Life and Actions of Jonathan Wild*, in *Romances and Narratives of Daniel Defoe*, ed. George Aitken, London, 1895, xvi, 235-78.

⁸ This edition was published by Andrew Millar in 1754. The signature "Henry Humbug," attached to the *Plan and Proposals for an Hospital*, is perhaps an ungenerous reflection on the late Henry Fielding.

The magazines gave no fame to the attack on John Fielding. *The Monthly Review* recognized it merely as "a satirical Squib, thrown from Grub-Street to Bow-Street."⁹ The writer for *The Critical Review* was apparently inclined to believe the charges against John Fielding: "This piece is written with great severity and some humour, which, however, we think is misplaced. There are some characters too wicked for ridicule."¹⁰

Despite this slight notice, the satirical squib did not pass into complete oblivion. It was reprinted in an edition of Henry Fielding's *Jonathan Wild*, published in 1840 to profit from the renewed interest in eighteenth century rogues and villains excited by William Harrison Ainsworth's novel, *Jack Sheppard*.

WILLIAM ROBERT IRWIN

Long Island University

DR. JOHNSON, MRS. THRALE, AND BOSWELL: THREE LETTERS

Professor E. L. McAdam, Jr. has lately shown that Samuel Johnson collaborated generously with his young protégé Sir Robert Chambers in writing the lectures which the latter gave at Oxford following his appointment in 1766 as Vinerian Professor of Law.¹ This partnership, long unknown to Johnsonians, is confirmed by a letter from Johnson to Mrs. Thrale which was found in 1939, in Longmont, Colorado, by the present writer. This letter, written on the first page of a folded sheet, lacks its direction. Probably it was sent in a cover, free, in care of Henry Thrale, M. P. But its tone and content identify the recipient beyond reasonable doubt, and its date enables us to recognize it as no. 211.1 in Dr. R. W. Chapman's census of Johnson letters.² "Miss" is clearly a reference to

⁹ xix (August, 1758), 202

¹⁰ vi (August, 1758), 174.

¹ "Dr. Johnson's law lectures for Chambers an addition to the canon," *RES*, xv, 385-391, and xvi, 159-168

² "Johnson's letters," *RES*, xiii, 152 This letter, 211.1, unseen by Dr Chapman, was sold at Sotheby's on 30 January, 1918, in a general dispersal of manuscripts mourned by all Johnson scholars. From London this letter came to Denver, Colorado, and thence to its present owner, Mr. J. W. Montgomery, who has given his kind permission for its publication.

Queeney; the rest of this first paragraph appears to deal with one of the perennial charity cases which aroused the joint sympathy of Johnson and the Thrales.³

Madam

Before I went, I promised to see the rent paid, and left ten pounds towards it. At club [*sic*] I met Langton, and nobody else, he is no richer than he was, but he gave me a guinea, and enquired after Miss ⁴

Chambers has no heart, so I shall have the pleasure of seeing you on Saturday, and next week will be the end of the course. If he had courage I think it might have been done by Wednesday

I am

Madam

Your most humble Servant

Sam: Johnson

Dec. 14. 1768

Mrs. Thrale seems to have been the only outsider who guessed at the literary secret between Johnson and Chambers. In *Thraliana* she listed the lectures among Johnson's works; in an unpublished journal lately discovered by Mr. James L. Clifford she wrote of her conjectures, saying that Johnson "used to visit the University at *Critical Times*, . . . or I thought so." In the present letter Johnson assumes a degree of knowledge on her part about the reason for his continued absence from Streatham. This message was written on a Wednesday, apparently from Oxford, to tell her that Chambers will not release him until the new lecture course (announced in *Jackson's Oxford Journal* to begin on January 14) is fully prepared. Chambers's habits of lethargy, of "wining and dining" to

To Dr Chapman and to Mr James L Clifford, biographer of Mrs. Thrale, the editor is indebted for most helpful comment.

³ Carter the riding-master, Coxeter, and others were at one time or another objects of charity in the Streatham circle. Johnson and Mrs Thrale also joined forces in supporting The Ladies' Charity School for Training Girls as Servants (cf. A. M. Broadley, *Dr Johnson and Mrs. Thrale*, London and New York, 1910, p. 121). "The rent" for this institution or for some poor family is doubtless in view here.

⁴ Johnson's encounter with Bennet Langton at the Club must have taken place, in the year 1768, on a Monday. Johnson's remark upon Langton's generosity in the face of straitened circumstances, is of passing interest because of Johnson's later appeal to Chambers on Langton's own behalf (letter of 19 April, 1783, in *Catalogue of the R. B. Adam Library*, I, 38-39).

the neglect of his lectures, had led Johnson in 1766 to offer his help to the candidate whom he had sponsored for the Vinerian Professorship, and for whose success Johnson therefore felt responsible.⁵ Johnson now complains that if Chambers had had more "heart," i. e. perseverance, the present work might not have been prolonged so annoyingly.

Another letter from Johnson to Mrs. Thrale, no. 707.1 in Chapman's list but not located by him, is now in the William A. Clark Library at the University of California, Los Angeles. It was written on the eve of a trip to Brighton whose purpose Johnson explained to Boswell, 17 October, 1780:

Mr Thrale's loss of health has lost him the election, he is now going to Brighthelmston, and expects me to go with him, and how long I shall stay I cannot tell I do not much like the place, but yet I shall go, and stay while my stay is desired.⁶

While on this reluctant holiday Johnson was busy with proof corrections for the *Lives of the Poets*,⁷ and probably the need for a small working library led him to write the second paragraph below.

Oct 16 1780

Dear Madam

Gell and Smith never came.⁸ The Steyning affair was undertaken by one Mr Jones, a Shoemaker, an old inhabitant of the King's Bench, of whom Mr Robson had that morning given me the character.⁹

⁵ See Johnson to Chambers, 11 December, 1766, in *Catalogue of the R. B. Adam Library*, I, 29. Further references to Johnson's present visit to New Hall Inn, Oxford, in December, 1768—from Johnson's diary and from his letter to Mrs. Thrale on the second of this month—are noted by McAdam, *RES*, xvi, 160.

⁶ *Life*, Hill-Powell ed., III, 441.

⁷ Johnson to John Nichols, Brighton, 26 October, 1780, in *Letters*, ed. Hill, II, 205-6.

⁸ Gell is probably Philip Gell of Hopton, Derbyshire, at whose house Johnson and Mrs. Thrale dined on 18 July, 1774 (Broadley, *op. cit.*, pp. 173 and 224), and of whom Johnson wrote Mrs. Thrale from Ashbourne the following summer (*Letters*, I, 348). Smith may well be Henry Smith of St. Albans, Henry Thrale's relative and future executor, who undertook an occasional business commission for Johnson (*Letters*, II, 210 n. and 219 n.; *Catalogue of the R. B. Adam Library*, I, 74-5).

⁹ The allusions in this sentence are obscure, and the scarcity of Mrs. Thrale's letters to Johnson in this season imposes an added handicap. Mr. McAdam kindly calls my attention to Johnson's visit to Steyning, a town in Sussex, on 10 November, 1782, as recorded in his Diary. Robson

Pray let me know when it is that we *must* go I will keep the day, but if it could be Saturday I should be glad, but the difference after all will be little more than that of burthening the luggage cart with more books or with fewer, yet I wish it could be Saturday, but make no effort about it, only let me know as soon as ever you can

I have seen Captain Burney and his cargo¹⁰ You may remember, I thought Baretta had not gained much by circumnavigating the world¹¹ I am, Madam, your most &c.

Sam Johnson

A third missing letter, of interest to Boswellians, is also found in the Clark collection. C. B. Tinker's edition of Boswell's *Letters*, I, 256, lists it as no. 167, unseen and not located by the editor. It is directed on the back "To Dr. Boswell." He was the writer's erratic uncle, John Boswell, M. D., of Edinburgh, who was chronically in debt and prone to borrow from his nephew, as the Boswell Papers show.

Dear Sir.

You tell me that if I will give 200 *guineas* for your curiosities, I shall have them. If not, you must take 200 *pounds* which you are offered Surely if you are to take *pounds* I might as well have the bargain in that way as another. This however is merriment—And to be serious—I have wished that my Father would purchase your *Cabinet*; but it seems he does not incline to do so.¹² You must then close with the offer made, for, I am in

was the Thrale attorney, well known to Johnson (*Letters*, II, 217 and 218); but the role of Mr Jones the shoemaker, evidently a familiar of the famous debtors' prison, is not clear. A mission of charity, similar to that implied in the first letter above, may be in view

¹⁰ On 14 October, 1780, Mrs Thrale wrote to Mrs Lambart. "Here is good News in Town, and Jamaica safe beside; & Miss Burney's Brother is come home from a Voyage round the World, & among the new Discovered Islands, where poor Cook was killed you know, Clerke died, & young Burney returned to England Captain of the Ship in which he set out an inferior Officer" (John Rylands Library, Eng. MS. 550, No 8, transcript by Mr Clifford).

¹¹ Probably a jocular reference to Baretta's *Journey from London to Genoa*, upon which Johnson had commented to Mrs. Thrale in 1770 (*Letters*, I, 165, cf. Johnson's remark to Boswell that "writers of travels were more defective than any other writers," *Life*, II, 377) The author of *Thraliana* wrote concerning Baretta. "Such, however, was his ignorance in a certain line, that he once asked Johnson for information who it was composed the Pater Noster" (A. Hayward and J. H. Lobban, *Dr Johnson's Mrs Thrale*, Edinburgh and London, 1910, p. 171).

¹² The nature of this museum seems to be unrecorded. Boswell reports

such circumstances, that I cannot afford sinking so much money as the value of the curiosities, for as the entail is now made, I shall have enough ado to save decent provisions for my children I ever am

your affectionate Nephew,

James Boswell

James's Court
30 August 1776

Boswell's "merriment" over his uncle's naive proposal was set down, as we know, upon a gloomy day in Edinburgh—the day after Boswell had covertly witnessed the burial of David Hume, and sought "resolutely" to banish the *frisson* of hell-fire in his bones by writing "letters to Dr. Johnson and Mr. and Mrs. Thrale, which did me good."¹³

DIXON WECTER

University of California, Los Angeles

"THOUGH, PHYLLIS, YOUR PREVAILING CHARMS"

In her checklist of Lord Dorset's poems, Miss Bagley has included "Though, Phyllis, your prevailing charms" on the ground that in *A Collection of Poems, viz., the Temple of Death . . .* 1701, a version of this poem is followed by an "Epilogue to Every Man in his Humour by the same author" and that this Epilogue is probably by Dorset.¹ This is not very solid ground, particularly when it is considered that in the earlier editions of this collection, though the poems appear in the same order, the phrase "by the same author" is omitted.² "Though, Phyllis, your prevailing charms" may be more convincingly ascribed to Buckingham. *MS.*

that Johnson, when in Edinburgh, "spent one forenoon at my uncle Dr Boswell's, who showed him his curious museum" (*Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides*, ed Pottle and Bennett, New York, 1936, p 385)

¹³ *Boswell Papers*, XII, 35

¹ Helen A. Bagley, "A checklist of the Poems of . . . Dorset," *MLN*, XLVII (1932), 454-6, see also R. G. Haworth, "Some Additions to the Poems of Lord Dorset," *MLN*, L (1935), 457-9.

² See *A Collection of Poems, Written upon several Occasions, By several Persons*, London, Printed for Hobart Kemp, 1672, pp. 28-32; and *ibid.*, Printed for Tho. Collins, 1673, pp. 28-32

Wood 416 contains a version of it followed by a note which says: "Made by the Duke of Buckingham one the 20 of Julii 1665, addressed to his mistress." Wood's note on this *MS.* is: "This I found written in a spare leaf before a romance called 'Eliaua' (Lond. 1661, fol.)."³ Miss Bagley observes that the poem in question "is similar to Dorset's other work," and it may appear to some very unlike Buckingham's. Most of the verses of this kind which Buckingham wrote, however, have never been printed; they are to be found in an unpublished commonplace book now in the possession of the Earl of Jersey, through whose kindness I have been able to study copies of them.⁴

ARTHUR MIZENER

Wells College

AN OBSERVATION ON CHAUCER'S *ASTROLABE*

The editors and other scholars who have spoken of Chaucer's *Treatise on the Astrolabe* have been accustomed to say that he wrote it for the ten-year-old child whom he calls, at the opening of the prologue, "Lyte Lowys my sone,"¹ and whom he addresses—with a couple of important exceptions—in the rest of the prologue and in the discourse itself. It is the purpose of the remarks which follow to consider the wisdom of making without reservation the statement that Chaucer wrote the treatise in the form we have it *for Lewis*.

Quotations from various editors and other writers will show the usual mode of referring to the *Astrolabe* ". . . addressed to his son Lowys by Geoffrey Chaucer . . .",² ". . . his 'littel son Lewis,' for whom he compiled the 'Astrolabie' . . .";³ ". . . [Chaucer] was pleased with his son's progress. Little Lewis had asked him if he might learn something about an astrolabe. The father at once sent

³ *The Life and Times of Anthony à Wood*, ed. Andrew Clark (Oxford, 1892), II, 42-3; see also *Notes and Queries*, Third Series, II, 442

⁴ Brief selections from this commonplace book were published in *The Quarterly Review*, CLXXXVII (1898), 86-112.

¹ F. N. Robinson, *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (1933), p. 641.—Lewis has been variously thought to be Chaucer's legitimate son, Chaucer's illegitimate son, and Sir Lewis Clifford's son.

² Walter W. Skeat, *A Treatise on the Astrolabe*, Chaucer Society, First Series, xxix (1872), title.—Not explicit, but cf. notes 4 and 6 and text.

³ J. W. Hales, *Dictionary of National Biography* (1887), "Chaucer."

him, a small astrolabe. . . . But he believes the Latin treatises to be too hard for his son's use, and the Conclusions in them to be too numerous. He therefore proposes to select some of the more important Conclusions, and to turn them into English with such modifications as would render them easier for a child to understand", ⁴ "... [The passage 'As I have shewed thee in the solid sphere'] is interesting, as shewing that Chaucer had already given his son some lessons on the motions of the heavenly bodies, before writing this treatise", ⁵ "... the Astrolabe, which he compiled for the use of his 'little son' Lewis ...", ⁶ "... little Lewis, for whom he compiled a treatise on the Astrolabe ...", ⁷ "... that Chaucer wrote the tract for his son Lewis ...", ⁸ "... Chaucer wrote in prose for an 11-year-old [*sic*] reader, whom he addresses as 'Litel Lowis my son,' a treatise on the use of the Astrolabe ...", ⁹ "... his *Treatise on the Astrolabe*, written in his later years for the use of 'litel Lowis my sone'", ¹⁰ "Chaucer's *Treatise* is an attempt to expound . . . the uses of the instrument and the elements of astronomy and astrology, for the benefit of 'litel Lowis my sone'", ¹¹ "... the introductory sentences addressed by the author to his little son"; ¹² "... the 'little son Lewis,' to whom the *Treatise on the Astrolabe* was dedicated . . .", ¹³ "Chaucer's *Treatise on the Astrolabe* is an attempt to describe in simple English, intelligible to a boy of ten, the structure and use of an instrument . . ."; ¹⁴ "We may picture Chaucer . . . working at the *Treatise*

⁴ Skeat, *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, Second Edition, III, lxxvi-vii [First edition 1894-97]—Also in Skeat, *Treatise*, p. xxi.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 354-55—Not explicit, but cf. notes 4 and 6 and text.—Also in Skeat, *Treatise*, p. 75

⁶ Skeat, *The Student's Chaucer* [1895], p. xiv

⁷ Alfred W. Pollard in *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, the Globe Edition (1898), p. xvii

⁸ Mark H. Liddell in *The Works*, Globe Edition, p. lxx

⁹ Pollard, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Fourteenth Edition, "Chaucer" [First appearance 1910-11]

¹⁰ Robert Kilburn Root, *The Poetry of Chaucer*, Revised Edition (1922), p. 23.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 85-86

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 86—Not explicit, but cf. notes 10 and 11 and text

¹³ Robert Dudley French, *A Chaucer Handbook* (1927), p. 74—Not explicit, but cf. p. 134 "the 'suffisaunt Astrolabe' which he [Chaucer] had given 'litell Lowis' was probably procured ready-made . . ."

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 133—Not explicit, but cf. note 13.

on the *Astrolabe* for his little son or godson named Lewis . . .";¹⁵ "The 'Litell Lowis, my sone,' . . . for whom Chaucer compiled his treatise on the *Astrolabe* . . .";¹⁶ ". . . 'Little Lewis,' for whom Chaucer composed the *Astrolabe* . . .";¹⁷ ". . . 'little Lewis' for whom he composed the *Astrolabe* . . .";¹⁸ ". . . a . . . work . . . translated for a little boy not yet able to use Latin . . .";¹⁹ "The boy for whom the English translation was made is addressed in the beginning as 'little Lewis, my son' . . .";²⁰ ". . . that Chaucer translated the *Astrolabe* for his own child. . . ." ²¹

From such statements as these the reader must inevitably get the impression that the *Astrolabe* was intended solely for the private use of Lewis. But should the reader perchance turn to a perusal of the *Treatise on the Astrolabe* itself, he would find in the prologue some puzzling passages. I have italicized them:

Lyte Lowys my sone, I apercyve wel by certeyne evydences thyn abilitie to lerne sciences touching nombres and proporciouns, and as wel conside I thy besy praiser in special to lerne the tretys of the Astrelabie Than for as mochel as a philosopfre saith, "he wrappith him in his frend, that condescendith to the rightfulle prayers of his frend," therefore have I even the a suffisant Astrolabie as for oure orizonte, compowned after the latitude of Oxenforde; upon which, by mediacioun of this litel tretys, I purpose to teche the a certain nombre of conclusions aperteynyng to the same instrument. I seie a certein of conclusions, for thre causes The first cause is this truste wel that alle the conclusions that han be founde, or ellys possibly might be founde in so noble an instrument as is an Astrelabie ben unknowe parfityly to eny mortal man in this regioun, as I suppose. Another cause is this, that sothly in any tretis of the Astrelabie that I have seyn there be somme conclusions that wol not in alle thinges parformen her bihestes, and somme of hem ben to harde to thy tendir age of ten year to conceyve

This tretis, divided in 5 parties, wol I shewe the under full lght reules and naked wordes in Engliish, for Latyn ne canst thou yit but small, my

¹⁵ George H. Cowling, *Chaucer* [1927], p. 31.

¹⁶ John Matthews Manly, *Canterbury Tales* (1928), p. 36.

¹⁷ Robinson, p. xix

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 640

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. xxi.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 640-41

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 641—For an exception, see G. L. Kittredge, "Lewis Chaucer or Lewis Clifford?" *Modern Philology*, xiv (1917), 514, n. 1; but this is not likely to be seen by most readers of Chaucer.—The chief authorities for such statements as cited are the prologue of the treatise (quoted in part below) and the discourse itself, notations in late hands in the MSS. E Museo 54 and Dd 3 53, and a passage in Lydgate (prologue to Book 1, *The Fall of Princes*).

litel sone But natheles suffice to the these trewe conclusions in Englishsh as wel as sufficith to these noble clerkes Grekes these same conclusions in Grek, and to Arabiens in Arabik, and to Jewes in Ebrew, and to the Latyn folk in Latyn, whiche Latyn folk had hem first out of othere dyverse langages, and writen hem in her owne tunge, that is to seyn, in Latyn And Got woot that in alle these langages and in many moo han these conclusions ben suffisantly lerned and taught, and yit by diverse reules, right as diverse pathes leden diverse folk the righte way to Rome *Now wol I preie mekely every discret persone that redith or herith this litel tretys to have my rude endityng for excusid, and my superfluite of wordes, for two causes. The first cause is for that curiours endityng and hard sentence is ful hevvy at onys for such a child to lerne And the secunde cause is this, that sothly me semith better to writen unto a child troyes a god sentence, than he forgete it onys.*

And Lowys, yf so be that I shewe the in my light Englishsh as trewe conclusions touching this mater, and not oonly as trewe but as many and as subtile conclusiouns, as ben shewid in Latyn in eny commune tretys of the Astrolabe, konne me the more thank And preie God save the king, that is lord of this langage, and alle that him feith berith and obeieith, everich in his degre, the more and the lasse *But consideere wel that I ne usurpe not to have founden this werk of my labour or of myn engyn I n'am but a lewd compiler of the labour of olde astrologiens, and have it translated in myn Englishsh oonly for thy doctrine And with this swerd shal I sleen envie . . .*²²

The first of the italicized passages is a direct address to a general reading audience, similar in its opening to the well-known "retraction,"²³ showing an anticipation that others than Lewis will peruse the treatise or hear it read. A similar expectation is implied in the second passage, for the concluding words, "And with this swerd shal I sleen envie," cannot well be taken to reveal that Chaucer feared criticism from a ten-year-old reader. They seem rather addressed to possible readers or hearers who might have such knowledge of the subject as to cavil at Chaucer's treatment of it.

The impression that the treatise may have been designed for other readers is perhaps heightened, rather than lessened, by the tone of the prologue as a whole: the formality of arrangement; the elaborate explanation of the employment of the English language; and the careful forestalling of criticism by the disclaimer of completeness and authority.

For what audience Chaucer intended the *Astrolabe* we have no ready means of knowing. There are four logical possibilities that are admissible *a priori*. (1) that Lewis was intended to be the sole

²² Robinson, pp. 641-42.

²³ Cf. *ibid*, p. 984

reader; (2) that the treatise was designed with Lewis in mind as its chief reader, but that it was expected that others might perhaps read the work or hear it read; (3) that the work, while perhaps originally intended for the use of Lewis, came to be thought of in the end as a literary production suitable for a more general audience; and (4) that the work, intended from the beginning as a literary translation (similar to the *Boece*), was cast into the conventional form of a piece of private instruction.

The first of these four possibilities, however, is eliminated by the import of the two italicized passages.²⁴ But it is this very possibility which will have been taken to be the only one by those who have read the statements about the *Astrolabe* previously cited.

Whichever of the other three possibilities may have been the fact, it seems evident in any event that the *Astrolabe* as we now have it was expected to be read (or heard) by others than Lewis. But most students of Chaucer are likely to become aware of the existence of the *Treatise on the Astrolabe* by reading one of the statements already cited, and they are moreover "little likely to attempt its perusal."²⁵ Since their impression of the work will probably always be limited to their knowledge of these secondary sources, it would seem that editors and others writing about Chaucer's *Astrolabe* should make clear that it was not a private communication which he addressed to Lewis for the latter's sole use, but rather a full-dress literary work in conventional form which he expected to be read, to some extent at least, by persons at large.

KARL ERIK ELMQUIST

*The Agricultural and Mechanical
College of Texas*

THE LAST OF THE MILLER'S HEAD?

A few years ago Professor Bartlett J. Whiting furnished us with some excellent exegesis of the powerful head of Chaucer's Miller; he showed that the adaptation of one's skull to the function of battering ram was a sport not confined to fourteenth century Eng-

²⁴ It is not the province of the present observation to consider which of the three remaining possibilities is the most likely. I hope at some future date, however, to be able to make a suggestion bearing on this point.

²⁵ Root, p. 86.

land, but was practised also by at least three live heroes of nineteenth century America.¹ These discoveries were amplified by Professor Autrey N. Wiley, who demonstrated that the tradition existed as early as the fifth century of our era, when Bishop Synesius of Ptolemais described a professional performer who made his living by exchanging butts with a veritable ram.² But these two commentators on pachycephaly have overlooked a striking example which proves that eighteenth century England had not yet bequeathed all her hard-headed gentry to the colonies. The person in question is none other than David Ritchie of Manor Water, the original of Scott's Black Dwarf, Elshie of the Mucklestones. Shortly after the publication in 1816 of Scott's novel (as part of the First Series of *Tales of My Landlord*) Robert Chambers identified Elshie with David, and gave an extensive account of the historical figure. Among other things Chambers says.

His skull, which was of an oblong and rather unusual shape, was said to be of such strength that he could strike it with ease through the pannel of a door or the end of a tar-barrel.³

In the introduction to the novel which appeared in the collected edition of 1829-33, Scott confirmed Chambers' guess, and said that he had met David Ritchie in 1797 when on a visit to Halyards, in Tweeddale.⁴ It will be observed that David, like the Miller and the Americans Butt Riley and Beezy Thomas, exhibited his prowess on doors; like Butt Riley he also used a barrel. Whether his butting a hole *through* the door, rather than butting the door off its hinges as the Miller had done, is a tribute to David's head, medieval doors, or modern hinges, cannot be ascertained.

But the sad case is that, if a recent article be trustworthy, there must be an end to these parallels as serving any useful point; for live examples are likely to prove endless. "Men with skulls on which rocks can be broken" are among the "born freaks" or aristocracy of the side-show world, an honor derived from the fact that they

¹ "The Miller's Head," *MLN*, LII (1937), 417-419.

² "The Miller's Head Again," *MLN*, LIII (1938), 505-507.

³ "Account of David Ritchie, the Original of the Black Dwarf," *The Edinburgh Magazine, and Literary Miscellany, being a New Series of the Scots Magazine*, I (1817) [Old Series, LXXX], 209-210.

⁴ *The Black Dwarf*, in *Waverley Novels*, ed. Andrew Lang, Boston, 1893, ix, 181-188.

are neither "made freaks" (like tattooed men and sword-swallowers) nor "two-timers" (temporary freaks, such as the tabloid heroines of murder trials).⁵ Thus while pachycephaly is without question a distinguishing feature, it is scarcely a vanishing one. Yet it does appear as a folklore motif in the representation of those contemporary men of renown from the American comic strip—Popeye the Sailor, who knocks down stone doors with his head, and Little Abner, who is expert at the mountain game of catching boulders on his skull, and who always arranges to land on his head when falling out of skyscrapers. Professor Whiting's "long, thick-set, line of heroes" has lived on actively into our own unheroic age.

The evidence is sobering; without these documents extending from fifth to twentieth century we might have labelled the Miller and Little Abner as mere folklore creations, spreading from a geographical center and unfounded in fact. We might even have gone the way of the comparative mythologists, and called on Ókubor, whose hammer Mjöllnir (meal-maker, or miller!) bruised many a skull among the *hrímpussar* and *bergrisar*,⁶ and whose own skull was thick enough not to be harmed seriously by the hone of the stone-headed giant Hrungrnir, which still sticks in Thor's head.⁷ The full implications of this mythological mélange I leave to others; we may perhaps content ourselves with more mundane hardheadedness.

FRANCIS LEE UTLEY

Ohio State University

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF SHELLEY'S TRANSLATIONS FROM PLATO

Shelley's translation of Plato's *Symposium* has been described with justice as "the poetry of a philosopher rendered by the prose of a poet."¹ The text of this excellent translation is, however, far from satisfactory, although it has been much improved by the

⁵ "Profiles. Lady Olga," *The New Yorker*, August 3, 1940, p. 24.

⁶ *Gylfaginning* xxi (Ernst Wilken, ed., *Die Prosaische Edda*, 2 vols., Paderborn, 1877-83, I, 30).

⁷ *Skáldskaparmál* xvii (Wilken, I, 104-105); see also *Lokasenna* 61 and 63 (Gustav Neckel, ed., *Edda*, 2 vols., Heidelberg, 1927, I, 105).

¹ R. G. Grylls, *Claire Clairmont* (London, 1939), 98.

discovery of the transcript which Mary Shelley made for the printers. On the basis of this transcript Roger Ingpen not only added the sections omitted in the 1840 edition but also furnished a better text.² Yet there remains room for improvement as Forman, Farrington, and the present writer have pointed out³ It is now known that many of the errors in the text and translation are not Shelley's own but are due to Mary's transcription of Shelley's MS. Shelley's handwriting has been notoriously difficult for editors to decipher.⁴ The basis for the detection of the errors has not been Shelley's original manuscript, which seems to have disappeared, but a comparison of the published translation with the Greek. But the comparison has not been systematic or complete, only the obvious errors in the published version have been detected. It is necessary therefore to compare Shelley's improved text, as it now appears complete for the first time in the Julian edition, with the Bipont text,⁵ which Shelley used in his translation, containing Ficino's Latin translation which Shelley consulted frequently in the interpretation of the Greek. As a result of this comparison the following notes are submitted as additions to the corrections already noted.

Page 169, line 37. 'nor would I choose.' The Julian edition follows the 1840 edition in this reading. The Transcript, however, reads 'nor would I willingly choose' which is certainly the correct reading for 'willingly' renders ἐκὼν (176 d2)⁶ of the Greek text.

Page 170, line 15 'Menalippe' is an error in transcription of 'Melanippe' which is a transliteration of Μελανίππη (177 a3). For similar errors in the transcription of Greek names cf. page 185, line 27, 'Naetenstriae' for 'Hetaeristriae.'

Page 173, line 21. 'the Greeks honoured Achilles.' 'Greeks' seems to be an error in the transcription of 'Gods' which is the translation of θεοί (180 a2).

² The Julian Edition of Shelley, ed Ingpen and Peck, VII, 165-220

³ H. B. Forman, *The Prose Works of Shelley* (London, 1880), III, B. Farrington, "The text of Shelley's Translation of the *Symposium* of Plato," *MLR*, xiv, 325, J. A. Notopoulos, "Note on the text of Shelley's Translation of the *Symposium*," *ibid*, xxxiv, 421-22

⁴ Cf. H. S. Salt, *A Shelley Primer* (London, 1887), 117.

⁵ J. A. Notopoulos, *loc cit*

⁶ J. Burnet's edition of Plato (*Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis*) is used for the references to the Greek text.

Page 181, line 9. 'by system and harmony.' 'System' should be emended to 'Rhythm,' as in Farrington's conjecture, page 181, line 6, for it is the same error in the transcription of 'rhythm,' the translation of ῥυθμῶ (187 d1).

Page 184, line 7: 'Ephialtus.' Forman emends to Ephialtes, but it is evident that Shelley wrote 'Ephialtus,' in ignorance of the nominative case of Ἐφιάλτου (190 b7).

Page 184, line 15 'Jupiter, with some difficulty having desired silence at length spoke.' Mr. Farrington says of this rendering, "Obviously Shelley wrote 'having *devised a scheme*.' The words 'scheme' and 'silence' would be readily confused in Shelley's script." It is quite evident that Farrington's emendation should now be accepted, for a comparison of it with Ficino's version of the Greek μόγυς δὴ ὁ Ζεὺς ἐννοήσας λέγει (190 c6), which he translated as 'Tandem sententiam suam explicuit,' shows that Shelley, at a loss how to render properly ἐννοήσας, translated Ficino's 'sententiam suam explicuit' by 'devised a scheme.'

Page 184, lines 22-3: 'I will cut them up in half again, so they shall go hopping on one leg.' It is possible that Shelley's MS. read 'so *that* they shall go etc.' and that in the transcription *that* was omitted.

Page 186, lines 35-6: 'now we have *dwindled* through our own *weakness*, as the Arcadians by the Lacedemonians' 'Dwindled' may be an error in the transcription of 'divided' which Shelley may have written following Ficino's 'scissi fuimus' for διωκίσθημεν (193 a2) of the Greek. Furthermore 'weakness' may be an error in the transcription of 'wickedness' which is a closer rendering of Ficino's 'inustitiam' and of the Greek.

Page 189, line 19: 'Jupiter' is clearly an error in the transcription of 'Iapetus' or 'Iapetus,' which is the transliteration of Ἰαπετοῦ (195 b7).

Page 191, lines 9-12: 'And who will deny that the divine poetry, by which all living things are produced upon the earth, is *not* harmonized by the wisdom of Love?' Forman suspects *not* and deletes it in his edition, but it should stand for Shelley rendered by it the Greek negative μὴ οὐχί (197 a2).

Page 195, line 10: 'to continue to possess them in future.' It is likely that Shelley wrote 'in *the* future' as the phrase 'for the future' (page 195, line 14) shows.

Page 195, lines 25-6. 'Now, remember of those things you said in your discourse.' Any question as to whether *of* should be left in the text is settled if it is observed that Shelley is here translating the Greek literally ἀναμνήσθητι, τίνων ἔφησθα ἐν τῷ λόγῳ (201 a2).

Page 207, lines 17-18: 'the divine, the original, the supreme, the self consistent, the monoëidic beautiful itself?', 'the self consistent' T. omitted 1840. As the words, 'the original, the supreme, the self consistent,' are not in the Greek, it seems that Shelley tried out various renditions of μονοειδής (211 e4) before he finally settled on 'the monoëidic beautiful,' without deleting, as is the case in many of his MSS., his previous attempts. The Julian editors, note here points to the same conclusion. In view of this the words 'the original, the supreme, the self consistent' should be bracketed.

Page 212, line 13. 'and often and often have I wished.' Inasmuch as the Greek here is καὶ πολλάκις μὲν ἡδέως ἂν ἴδοιμι (216 c1), Shelley rendered πολλάκις by 'and often' and unconsciously repeated it without deleting one of the identical phrases. The transcript thus copied both, one of which should be bracketed.

Page 213, line 27. 'motioned to depart.' Inasmuch as the Greek here is ἐβούλετο (217 d5), Shelley may have written 'wanted to depart' which was mistakenly transcribed as 'motioned.'

Page 215, line 4: 'gold instead of mountain brass.' 'Mountain' is meaningless here; it is clearly an error in transcription of 'moulding brass' by which Shelley rendered χαλκείων (219 a1). Cf. page 191, line 19. 'and Vulcan that of moulding brass' for corroboration.

Page 215, lines 13-16. 'After this conversation I believed and hoped that my words had wounded him as with a weapon, so rising from my couch and permitting him to say no more, as casting this garment around us both (for it was winter) I lay the whole night etc.' It is evident that Shelley's sentence is confused as it stands. If *as* is emended to *and* (perhaps Shelley's & in the MS. being mistaken here for *as*) the sentence follows the Greek text.

Page 215, line 24: 'the contest of my mind.' 'Contest' here may be an error in the transcription of 'state of mind' which is closer to διάνοιαν (219 d3) of the Greek; if 'contest' is retained it can only be understood as bringing out the force of the particles μέν, δέ in the phrase ἡγούμενον μὲν ἡτιμάσθαι, ἀγόμενον δὲ τὴν τούτου φύσιν (219 d3-4).

Page 215, line 32: 'Ajax by wine.' Shelley wrote 'iron' here, translating σιδήρῳ (219 e2) which was confused in the transcription with *wine*. It is to be noted that Shelley translates elsewhere in the text the Greek for 'wine' correctly. We have a corroboration for the reading of 'iron' in the text in "The Diary of Clara Mary Jane Clairmont" the typescript of which made available to me through the courtesy of Professor N. I. White. Claire Clairmont read Shelley's translation of Plato's *Symposium* August 14-16, 1819. In her entry for July 3, 1820, she refers to this passage in the *Symposium* and speaks of the invulnerability of Socrates to gold as was Achilles to steel. Though she is inaccurate in her allusion, mistaking 'Achilles' for 'Ajax' and 'steel' for 'iron,' she reveals the true reading of Shelley's text to be 'iron' rather than 'wine'

Plato's Ion; or, of the Iliad

Page 234, lines 19-20 'Whether do you demonstrate these things better in Homer or Hesiod?' Shelley translated here correctly the first word of the sentence πότερον (531 a1) by *whether*, but as he read on and got to its correlative ἤ, *or*, he forgot to delete *whether* which is superfluous in the English translation of πότερον . . . ἤ. That Shelley knew how to render πότερον . . . ἤ idiomatically is seen on page 234, lines 11-12: 'Do you excel in explaining Homer alone *or* are you etc.' Cf. also page 235, line 20. In view of this, *whether* should not only be bracketed here but also on page 235, lines 25-6: 'Among a number of persons given their opinions on the wholesomeness of different foods, *whether* would one person be capable . . . *or* would etc.' where Shelley must also have forgotten to delete the unnecessary literal translation of πότερον.

Fragments from Plato's Republic

Page 258, line 28, the notation *C. xi* at the end of the fragment seems to be an error in transcription for *C. vi*, for *C. xi* does not refer to chapter xi; the section translated in the second fragment belongs to Book ii, chapters XIII-XIV (373 a-e7). But since Shelley used E. Massey's⁷ text of the *Republic* for his translation (for the page references in fragment vii are to this edition only), and since Massey's text does not contain chapter subdivisions,

⁷ E. Massey, *Platonis de Republica* (Cambridge, 1713).

Shelley could only have written *C ũ* for Book 11. That he uses *C (aput)* as well as *L (iber)* for 'Book' cf. Frgs XIV-XVI, XIX.

Page 262, line 19: '(so desperate are these diseases of body and mind)' The remark in the parenthesis is not found in the Greek text (405 a). It turns out to be a parenthetical remark which Shelley, as in the other fragments, interpolated in the text. It should therefore be italicized like the rest of his interpolated remarks. Cf. Frgs. XIII, XVIII.

Page 262, line 29: 'of the seasons (*ετητειν*).’ The Greek is either the transcriber’s or the printer’s error for *επετειων* (405 c9) of Massey’s text. Shelley here omits Greek accents, as was his usual custom.

Page 263, lines 30-1. 'Such a one were indeed an honourable judge and a good.' It is evident that we must either omit '(a) good,' or else add 'a good *one*' in order to make sense. Probably the transcriber or printer omitted *one* since *one* also occurs at the beginning of the sentence, and in the 1840 edition directly in the same place in the line above it.

JAMES A. NOTOPOULOS

Trinity College,
Hartford, Conn

A BRETON ROMANTICIST, MME AUGUSTE PENQUER

Mme Auguste Penquer (Léocadie Hersent) was born in 1817 at the château de Kérourartz near the town of Lannilis in the Finistère, where she spent her childhood and youth, reading widely in the writings of the Romanticists, notably of Chateaubriand, Lamartine, and Hugo. She must have herself begun versifying at a comparatively early age, in the solitary manor of her parents, in the woods and on the sea-shore of Brittany, but it was not until she was well into middle life that "sur les vives et affectueuses instances de Lamartine, son ami et son maître,"¹ she published her first volume, *les Chants du foyer*. A few years later appeared her

¹ Quoted from the biographical preface to Mme Penquer's posthumous *Mes nuits* (p. ix) This preface is composed of extracts from a paper read by Edouard Langeron, professor of history at the *lycée* of Brest, before the "Société académique de Brest" at its session of Jan. 6, 1890.

Révélation poétiques,² which was followed, in 1868, by *Vellédâ*, an epic which Edouard Langeron considers "le point éblouissant de sa carrière," the work which, perhaps, most consistently incarnates the double passion that ruled her entire life, "glorifier l'idée chrétienne et chanter la Bretagne."³ For many years Mme Penquer published only occasional poems in local periodicals, but the death of her husband, a physician who was for a time mayor of Brest, revived her Muse, and she began composing the verse which was to make up *Mes nuits*, a volume described by Langeron as "en quelque sorte le testament de son cœur qu'elle a voulu laisser à ses enfants."⁴ The same critic tersely sums up his impressions of the poetess in these words: "Mme Penquer était donc, dans la plus complète acception du mot, un poète de race."⁵ She died in 1889.

Mme Penquer's first volume, *les Chants du foyer*,⁶ is little more than a protracted testimonial of indebtedness to Lamartine. A brief preface by the author, dated Brest, June 22, 1862, begins with an epigraph from the master and is followed by a laudatory letter from his pen. The very first poem of the collection is entitled "A M. de Lamartine qui m'engage à publier mes vers"; another poem, "l'Aigle et le rossignol," tells us:

A l'âge où les enfants vont courir dans les herbes . . .
Moi, je chantais déjà; déjà j'étais poète .
Moi, je savais déjà des vers de Lamartine⁷

"A Monsieur de Lamartine" entreates the great poet not to abandon his art:

Ne brise pas ta lyre, enfant de l'harmonie, . .
Lamartine, tes vers te font plus grand qu'un roi⁸

In "le Vrai poète" Mme Penquer expresses a thoroughly Romantic conception of the nature and function of the poet:

² The volume was published "sans date." Langeron (*loc. cit.*, p. x) says that it came out two years after *les Chants du foyer*, i. e., in 1864, but Mendès (*Dictionnaire bibliographique et critique des principaux poètes du XIX^e siècle*, p. 224) gives 1865 as its date.

³ *Loc. cit.*, pp. xi, xii.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. xiii.

⁵ P. xiv.

⁶ The copy of this work in the possession of the University of Texas library bears on the fly-leaf the following handwritten inscription: "A Monsieur N. Vila, hommage de haute gratitude, Léocadie A. Penquer, Brest, le 31 juillet, 1865."

⁷ *Les Chants du foyer* (Didier, 1862), pp. 107-08.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 141-145.

C'est celui qui comprend et chérit la nature,
 Qui voit son Dieu partout, penseur religieux!
 C'est celui qui méprise et flétrit l'imposture,
 C'est celui dont le vers est libre, audacieux,
 Sans effort et sans frein, sans travail, sans rature
 C'est Hugo, c'est Chénier, Lamartine et Brizeux °

"La Poésie," addressed to Lamartine, protests against his implication that the days of great poetry are past.

Vous, le plus grand de tous, le plus noble aujourd'hui
 Des poètes sur qui le feu céleste a lui
 En quoi Tacite est-il supérieur à Racine
 Et le divin Platon au divin Lamartine ?
 Pourquoi donc condamner, mépriser l'harmonie,
 Pourquoi nier des vers la puissance infinie ;
 Vous, chantre du Seigneur, né pour l'Eternité ?
 Oubliez-vous, hélas ! que vous avez chanté ?
 Que vous avez parlé cette langue immortelle ?
 Que vous l'avez aimée ? O poète infidèle !
 Oubliez-vous, hélas ! que des accords divins,
 Dans vos jours les plus beaux, ont vibré sous vos mains ? ¹⁰

And Mme Penquer includes herself in the group of "humbles esprits formés à votre école."¹¹ In "le Siècle," the poetess speaks to her son to whom she holds up Hugo and Lamartine as examples of the life he should lead. "Lectures" is another piece of counsel, this one addressed to a nephew, who is advised to take advantage of the enforced leisure which winter brings in its train to read extensively :

Tous les jours tu liras des vers de Lamartine
 Tu suivras du regard l'Aigle qui nous domine
 Et fend les airs, d'un vol toujours audacieux,
 Pour vivre loin de nous et planer dans les cieux.
 Renouant, tour à tour, tous les fils de sa vie,
 Tu rediras ces noms que j'aime et que j'envie ;
 Graziella, Julie, Elvire, Régina,
 Et Laurence, doux nom que sa main couronna !
 Puis tu liras Hugo, qui fut si fort athlète ! ¹²

But the young man must not confine himself to these two poets ; "Lis Delphine, lis Stael," he is exhorted, and also Chateaubriand, Rousseau, and Chénier, who "créa le vers libre en dépit de Boi-

° P. 194

¹⁰ Pp. 196-97, 201.¹¹ P. 201.¹² Pp. 297-98.

leau!"¹³ Many of the other "songs of the fireside," such, for example, as "le Vallon" and "Découragement," are typically Lamartinian *méditations*. Lamartine, however, had a close rival in Hugo for the affections of the Breton poetess, "le Proscrit de Jersey" lauds that "génie ardent et solitaire," the "aigle qui vit dans la tempête," and adjures him:

Esprit qui vit sur la montagne,
Viens me révéler tes secrets,
A moi la fille de Bretagne!
A moi la fille des forêts!¹⁴

But Hugo had to content himself with second place in the esteem of Mme Penquer; in the penultimate poem of *les Chants du foyer*, "Mes actions de grâce: à Monsieur de Lamartine," she bursts into a veritable paean of gratitude and praise:

Poete, sois béni! sois béni dans ta vie!
Sois béni par ma voix, par mon âme ravie
Par cet amour que Dieu mit dans mon cœur pour toi!
Sois béni pour m'avoir reçue, encouragée,
Pour m'avoir applaudie et m'avoir protégée!
Pour m'avoir pris la main, oh! sois béni par moi!

Sois béni pour m'avoir ouvert ton sanctuaire,
Doux nid où si souvent tu fus heureux naguère!
Où si souvent ton rêve illumina tes jours!
Doux nid où maintenant tu crois te mettre à l'ombre,
Sans songer que l'éclair ne sort que d'un ciel sombre!
Que ton front rayonnant rayonnera toujours!

Sois béni pour m'avoir donné courage et joie!
Pour m'avoir dit d'aller où le Seigneur m'envoie!
Vers de purs horizons ou bien vers l'infini!
Pour m'avoir dit —"Madame, il faut ouvrir votre aile!
L'avenir vous prépare une page immortelle!"
Pour m'avoir dit cela, poete, sois béni!¹⁵

Les Chants du foyer is a volume of respectable size, containing about a hundred forty poems, some of which are seven or eight pages in length. Its appearance gave rise, and with complete justice, to criticisms of the author's indebtedness to Lamartine. Mme Penquer

¹³ Pp. 299-300.

¹⁴ Pp. 313, 318, 319. Hugo, as we shall see, replied to this poem with one of his characteristically high-flown complimentary epistles.

¹⁵ Pp. 342-43. The poem is dated May 27, 1862.

felt called upon to reply to her critics, and she took advantage of the publication of her second volume, *Révélation poétiques*, to do so. In a preface, "A mes amis," dated at Brest, Nov. 1, 1864, she describes her new book and her own poetic ideals, and, admitting that *les Chants du foyer* had been inspired by Lamartine, she defends herself against the charge that she was a mere imitator by insisting that it is impossible to be totally original in poetry. She argues:

Les poètes sont les traducteurs Quand ils ne traduisent pas l'homme,
ils traduisent Dieu c'est toujours l'humanité, c'est toujours la divinité
qui les inspire Ainsi je dois au cygne de Mâcon l'initiation et la voix,
à l'aigle de Guernesey je dois le courage et l'essor

Mme Penquer then prints a letter written her by Hugo from Hauteville-House on Nov. 6, 1862, to thank her for *les Chants du foyer* and especially for the poem in his honor, "le Proscrit de Jersey." In his usual antithetical manner, the exile praises this composition as the best in the volume, because its verses "contiennent le sentiment de l'infini. L'infini et l'idéal, ce sont les deux pôles du poète, l'idéal, quand il songe à l'homme, l'infini, quand il songe à Dieu." He urges her to advance "dans la voie sacrée" and, at the same time, to voice her pity "pour tout ce qui souffre." "Tendez," he continues, "une main aux étoiles et l'autre aux misères. . . . Croyez au progrès car le progrès de l'homme est la manifestation de Dieu." Mme Penquer wrote a "Réponse au proscrit de Jersey" in verse, which she sent Hugo with a request for permission to print his letter and her poem. The permission was granted in a second very flattering letter, which is also reproduced, with the proper complimentary comments, at the close of the preface.

Révélation poétiques is virtually a replica of *les Chants du foyer*, except that the influence of Hugo is more marked, while that of Lamartine remains undiminished. It opens with the "Réponse au proscrit de Jersey," an ecstatic development of the theme of "l'infini et l'idéal" suggested by Hugo, who is apotheosized as "maître divin," "réformateur," "plus fort que Prométhée."¹⁶ The same tone of deification is to be noted in "A l'auteur des *Contemplations*," and in a sonnet "A Victor Hugo: en lui offrant *les Chants du foyer*," Mme Penquer confesses that, since childhood, there has been "un rêve que je cache en mon cœur tourmenté"; this "rêve"

¹⁶ *Révélation poétiques* (Didier, s. d.), pp. 7, 10, 11.—The poems in this volume are dated in various months of 1862, 1863, and 1864.

is "un regard de toi!"¹⁷ It is to be expected, therefore, that her poetry should often have a Hugolian ring. This is particularly true wherever she has occasion (as in "Aparté," with an epigraph from Hugo) to speak of the function of poetry and the poet, or when, as in "A la Pologne," she ventures into the domain of the political ode; "Une Nuit de décembre" (dedicated to Alexandre Piedagnel) is reminiscent of Hugo's humanitarian poems in its contrast of the luxuries of the rich with the miseries of the poor. And, heeding the advice extended her in Hugo's letter, Mme Penquer is constantly preoccupied with "l'idéal" and "l'infini."¹⁸ But the presence of Hugo in *Révélations poétiques* by no means displaced that of Lamartine; for it is of him that we are reminded not only by the very title of the volume but also whenever the poetess speaks of love or of inspiration, not to mention actual references to him by name. "Devant le portrait de M. de Lamartine" is a sonnet inspired by a painting of Leloir sent to Mme Penquer, we are led to assume from a foot-note, as an "hommage de l'illustre poète à l'auteur des *Chants du foyer*",¹⁹ and "Mes heures" is an extension of the two most famous lines of "le Lac," which serve as its epigraph. Despite the similarity of *les Chants du foyer* and *Révélations poétiques*, the latter volume is superior to its predecessor at least prosodically. Mme Penquer's most ambitious effort, however, was put forth not in the field of lyric poetry but in the epic. In a Hugolian preface to her *Velléda* (Didier, 1869), in defense of poetry in general and of the epic in particular in an age of prose, she points to Hugo, Lamartine, and Musset as the great poetic trinity of the century and states that, since childhood, she had been intensely interested in the stirring events in the life of the Armorican heroine. She then admits that her epic is really a versification of portions of Chateaubriand's *les Martyrs*; as a matter of fact, each

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p 339 The poem is dated October, 1862

¹⁸ On the occasion of Hugo's seventy-eighth birthday, Mme Penquer addressed him a fulsome ode, *A Victor Hugo* (Brest, Evain-Roger, 1880), in which she declares that his poetry was the source of her inspiration and his approval of her work her "plus belle victoire" After discussing his struggles, his misfortunes, and his magnificent triumph, she concludes:

— tu peux porter des mondes sur ta tête
Comme Atlas On se dit que, géant et prophète,
Poète-Dieu, tu peux, de ton éternité,
Voir, éternel vivant, ton immortalité.

¹⁹ *Révélations poétiques*, p 157; dated at Paris, June 18, 1864.

of the cantos of *Velléda* has a quotation from the prose work as epigraph. "Les yeux fixés sur le Grand-Bey" (sic), "j'ai invoqué l'ombre auguste du chanfre de la Vestale," remarks the Breton poetess:

je lui ai demandé l'inspiration et j'ai reçu l'inspiration; je lui ai demandé la lyre et j'ai reçu la lyre, je lui ai demandé la voix et j'ai reçu la voix j'ai chanté—Tacite a nommé la divinité, Chateaubriand a révélé la prêtresse, j'ai mis la femme dans la prêtresse et dans la divinité ²⁰

The epic is preceded by a verse "Prologue," written at Carnac on May 1, 1865, in honor of Brittany, its ancient Druidic religion and religious symbols, its landscapes and seascapes, and particularly *Velléda*, "fille de ma Bretagne." The poem tells of the love of *Velléda* for the Christian Roman pro-consul, Eudore, her renunciation of the religion of the Druids and her conversion to Christianity, and, finally, here self-immolation. The epic is hyper-Romantic both in subject-matter and in treatment, as the "national" theme is almost wholly subordinated to that of the love of the two principal characters, a love which is described in language that is at once passionate and chaste. A meritorious effort, *Velléda* could scarcely be used to disprove the oft-repeated statement that the French are incapable of writing epic poetry on the classical model.

From the publication of *Velléda* to the death of her husband in 1883, Mme Penquer wrote only a few poems, which appeared as separate *plaquettes*. Lemerre brought out a posthumous collection of her verse, *Mes nuits*, dedicated "à celui qui n'est plus, mon bien-aimé mari, le Docteur Auguste Penquer, sa pauvre femme, L.-Ate. Penquer, 1883." The poems of this volume are assembled in three groups: "Veuve," "Chrétienne," "Grand'mère"; the last of these is an obvious imitation of Hugo's *l'Art d'être grand-père*, being devoted chiefly to Mme Penquer's daughter and the latter's three little girls. The second of the grandchildren, Mathilde, was born on Feb. 26, 1882, which was also Hugo's birthday, a coincidence which afforded the poetess a double occasion for celebration. The result was "la Naissance de Mathilde," which begins:

Tu nais dans ce beau jour de fête,
Beau jour dont la France a l'orgueil.
C'est la fête du grand poète,
Aujourd'hui l'immortel Aïeul ²¹

²⁰ Dated at Brest, Nov. 1, 1868.

²¹ *Mes nuits* (Lemerre, 1891), p. 256; note the rhyme of "orgueil" and "Aïeul."

Mme Penquer could not let slip so timely an opportunity to express to Hugo her gratitude for what she owed him.

Et c'est vers Lui que je m'incline
 En baisant ton front nouveau-né
 L'humaine loi, la loi divine,
 C'est lui qui m'aura tout donné ²²

The volume closes with what was probably Mme Penquer's last poetic effort, "Derniers vers," inscribed "à mon petit-fils Louis C——", it is dated Nov. 4, 1889, and reads:

Velléda fut le nom de mon amour suprême;
 Dès que j'ai pris mon luth, ce nom je l'ai chanté!
 Mais il me rendra plus qu'il n'a reçu lui-même
 S'il doit porter le mien à la postérité
 Après ma mort, ce nom, inscrit sur ma couronne,
 De mes petits-enfants sera le juste orgueil,
 Et ce nom, célébré par ma lyre bretonne,
 Sera gravé par eux, près du mien, sur leur seul

It was in her Breton poems, then, and especially in *Velléda*, that Mme Penquer placed her hopes for immortality. Time, however, has proved her to have been merely an ambitious, if somewhat feeble, follower of Lamartine, Hugo, and Chateaubriand.

AARON SCHAFFER

The University of Texas

AN EXCHANGE OF NOTES OVER GEORGE SAND

Sainte-Beuve wrote to a friend on July 13, 1833:

Planche a failli avoir un duel avec Dumas au sujet de Mme D ; ça a été un peu ridicule et un peu scandaleux, au désavantage apparent de Planche, quoique les torts réels fussent du côté de Dumas." ¹

There has been some question as to the identity of Mme D. Jean Bonnerot suggests in a note to his edition of the above letter that she might be Mme Drouet as well as Mme Dudevant, that is George Sand; but the following unpublished letters ex-

²² *Idem*.

¹ J. Bonnerot, *Correspondance générale de Sainte-Beuve*, Paris, Stock, 1935, I, 370. The letter is addressed to Victor Pavie.

changed by Dumas and Planche indicate that Sainte-Beuve was talking about the second. These letters are also interesting for Planche's denial of a rumor that he was George Sand's "amant," a relationship which the novelist herself had felt impelled to disclaim on at least two occasions.²

It appears that Planche was unwittingly drawn into a feud between the two novelists. Irrked by reported comments attributed to Dumas, George Sand demanded an explanation of him one day when she happened to be escorted by Planche. Not aware that the meeting was accidental, Dumas assumed that the critic had accompanied her to serve as defender and sought a duel with him. This much we infer from the following note sent by Dumas to George Sand after the encounter:

J'ai dit et je le signe

—Madame, lorsqu'on vient demander une explication en se faisant accompagner d'un homme, on rend l'homme responsable des suites: je ferais volontiers l'homme qui vous accompagne responsable de ces suites, mais il paraît, puisqu'il ne veut pas descendre, qu'il *me tourne le dos* j'aurais cependant volontiers un duel avec lui

A Dumas³

Planche could not ignore this direct affront and sent Dumas a challenge which I have not seen but whose existence is attested by Dumas' acceptance, which follows:

Vous m'avez mal compris mon cher Planche. j'ai tenu à rétablir les faits dans leur exacte vérité, mais je tiens en même temps beaucoup à la rencontre que vous me proposez. ces choses-là sont comme un dîner, elles s'acceptent toujours, à moins qu'on ne soit invité autre part

Je suis donc, comme vous me l'avez demandé, à vos ordres pour le jour et le lieu quant aux armes, ça sera l'affaire de nos témoins

Tout à vous

Dumas

J'allais vous écrire hier lorsque j'ai reçu votre lettre, une guerre de propos me va peu et comme je vous crois de l'influence sur George S., je comptais vous rendre responsable de tous les caquets qu'elle me faisait depuis deux jours. vous voyez que votre lettre a prévenu la mienne et voilà tout je vous remercie du bon goût de votre provocation; vous voyez que je sais la comprendre et y répondre⁴

² Cf. "Lettres de George Sand à Sainte Beuve," *Revue de Paris*, Nov. 15, 1896, and J. Bonnerot, *op cit*, I, 370.

³ Collection S de Lovenjoul (E 889, fol. 6), unpublished.

⁴ Collection S de Lovenjoul (E 889, fol. 7), unpublished.

But Planche was more prudent than the fire-eating Dumas, and saw no reason for fighting without due cause. Refusing to assume any responsibility for George Sand's actions or statements, he sought to establish the premise that his quarrel with Dumas was purely personal, that he had challenged the novelist only because the latter had questioned his courage. He wrote to a third party:

Monsieur,

J'ai mûrement pesé les lignes signées de Dumas que vous m'avez apportées hier lundi 24 juin 1833 et voici les questions que je trouve convenable et nécessaire de poser à propos de ces lignes.

Vous m'obligerez, Monsieur, en priant Dumas de les résoudre clairement, par écrit, et avec sa signature.

1. Quand il a dit qu'en refusant de descendre au jardin je paraissais lui *tourner le dos*, quelle était sa pensée, son intention, quel sens positif attachait-il à ces paroles?
2. A-t-il voulu dire que je craignais de le voir et de lui parler?
3. N'a-t-il pas su par Buloz que je voulais descendre et que Buloz s'y est opposé?
4. Ne sait-il pas que j'ai quitté la maison plusieurs minutes seulement après la fin de la discussion, et qu'il lui suffisait de monter pour me parler?
5. N'est-il pas vrai que j'ai répondu à ces mots prononcés par lui . . . : *Je vous cherchais, par ceux-ci je suis prêt à vous entendre, voici deux personnes qui nous entendront?*
6. N'est-il pas également vrai qu'entre Dumas et moi il n'a été question absolument que de Buloz?

Ayez, Monsieur, l'obligeance de m'envoyer dans la journée la solution signée de ces questions au bureau de la revue entre trois et quatre heures, et je vous ferai porter ma réponse

[June 25, 1833]

Gustave Planche ⁵

There is now a gap of two items in the "dossier," the first being Dumas' reply to the above inquiry and the second, Planche's next communication. The latter contained a denial that there existed between George Sand and Planche anything more than friendship, as we gather from this note from Dumas which closed the correspondence:

Mon cher Planche

Le bruit public vous désignait comme l'amant actuel de mad. G. S. Vous donniez créance à ce bruit en accompagnant cette dame lorsqu'elle

⁵ Collection S. de Lovenjoul (E 889, fol. 9), unpublished.

me vint demander une explication ne pouvant donc avoir une affaire avec elle, je désirais bien sincèrement en avoir une avec vous

Aujourd'hui vous me dites que n'étant pas son amant vous ne pouvez ni ne devez répondre de ses propos passés, ni futurs, et que le bras que vous lui donniez ne lui était donné ni à titre de défenseur ni à titre de répondant. Vous comprenez que dès lors le mot qui vous a blessé n'est plus de ma part qu'une absurdité, considérez-le comme tel et dites, je vous supplie, dans le premier article que vous ferez sur moi, que je suis un imbécille [sic] je l'aurai bien mérité en vous cherchant à vous une aussi sotte querelle

Tout à vous

A. Dumas *

"L'amant *actuel*"! Dumas did not want his penitence misconstrued; he still had a quarrel with George Sand.

Whether or not Dumas was convinced that George Sand and Planche were merely good friends, others among their contemporaries remained skeptical, one of them saying:

Tu sais que l'affaire de Planche et de Dumas s'est arrangée, comme cela était facile à prévoir. Planche a déclaré par écrit qu'il n'était pas l'amant de Madame Sand (ce que je regarde comme un lâche mensonge, car ils vivent ensemble) et Dumas lui a alors répondu que dans ce cas il avait eu tort de s'exprimer comme il avait fait.⁷

We must conclude that the writer was mistaken, but his mistake seems justifiable when we consider that a scant two months later Planche did fight a duel for George Sand, a gesture which earned him the loss of her friendship and the hatred of Alfred de Musset, whose duty it then was, by George Sand's own admission, to defend her.

CLAUDE P. VIENS

The University of Illinois

* Collection S de Lovenjoul (E 889, fol 11), unpublished

⁷ Collection S de Lovenjoul (E 889, fol 13), unpublished. Written by Jacques-Alexandre Bixio (1808-1865), who was with Buloz co-founder of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, to Pierre Tousez, dit Bocage (1797-1863), an able interpreter of Romantic drama and director of the Odéon

THREE NEW LETTERS OF MATTHEW ARNOLD

Matthew Arnold and Australia are not names which even to the Arnold enthusiast have much connection, but he had a son employed as a bank clerk in Melbourne and some letters in the Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, New Zealand, form an interesting link between the essayist and the then distant colony. All three, which are published with the consent of the family, are addressed to R. D. Adams, a Sydney business man, about whom a word of introduction will throw further light on the nature of the correspondence.

Robert Dudley Adams (1829-1912) was a busy figure in the Sydney shipping and commercial world and a literateur of some note in the Australia of his day, a contributor to Sydney and English magazines and the author of a volume of verses, *The Song of the Stars and other Poems* (Melbourne, 1882), which he published under the nom-de-plume of "Alpha Crucis." An indefatigable if indiscriminating correspondent with literary figures in England (to whom he sent copies of his verses, often receiving presentation copies in return), he accumulated from such sources autograph letters, the main value of most of which lies probably in the signatures. The Turnbull Library has letters to Adams from several minor women novelists (Ouida is their major constellation), from R. D. Blackmore and Walter Pater. Adams was a practised celebrity hunter, but the majority of his correspondents contented themselves with one fairly formal letter of thanks.

The Arnold letters, however, stretch over a couple of years (1881-82) and forming a sequence are of somewhat greater interest. The Adams side of the correspondence is missing, though the letters may well be among the Arnold papers, but its general purport may be readily guessed at from Arnold's comments. Adams' first letter introduced himself with some account of his own literary life and of the book trade in Australia, the second contained a copy of a review by him of Arnold's work, and the third, inspired by a newspaper report of Arnold's projected American tour and a possible extension to Australia, invited him warmly to Sydney. Arnold replied pessimistically. He does not expect Whitehall to allow him sufficient time off to see even America, let alone the

"Colonies in Australia." In 1883, however, the American tour did take place but Adams' persuasions were unable to entice Arnold across the Pacific, and the *Discourses in America* of 1885 were followed by no *Discourses in Australia*.

Education Dept.,
Whitehall

Jany 23rd 1881

My dear Sir,

Your letter reaches me at a very busy moment, but I must write you a line of acknowledgment, the more so as you have had the trouble of posting your letter twice. I am a school-inspector, and a letter addressed to me at Whitehall is therefore safe to find me. A letter simply addressed to me at London not unfrequently finds me, but it is uncertain, it all depends on the clerk who sorts the letters, if he is in a hurry, and sees a letter with such an address as London, he throws it aside as insufficiently addressed and to be returned to destination.

You do not give a brilliant account of the Sydney libraries and book-trade. They seem to be much ahead of you at Melbourne. My publisher told me that the agent for the Melbourne book-trade took 50 copies of a single book of mine—"God and the Bible"—and I am not at all a popular author. My poems are published by Macmillan, in two volumes, they are at present out of print, but a new edition is preparing. I will with pleasure send you the second edition of my mixed Essays, which has just appeared, since you take an interest in what I write and have difficulty in getting my books in Sydney. I have read with interest what you tell me of the Catholic action in the schools of your colony, the real conflict of the Catholics at present is, however, with Positivism as in France, not with Protestantism as amongst our people.

I remain, very truly yours,

Matthew Arnold

R Dudley Adams Esq

Athenaeum Club,
Pall Mall, S W

July 7th, 1881

My dear Sir,

One line to thank you for your letter, and for the review, which has indeed been maltreated by the printer, but it interested me to see that you had seized on the very points which I myself should have wished to put before your Australian readers.

I live out of London and see very few literary men, nor have I even any personal acquaintance at all with several of those whom you mention. Edwin Arnold is no relation of mine, though I know him slightly, and

occasionally have communication with him; I will certainly tell him, if ever I get an opportunity, what you say of his "Light of Asia"

From time to time the power of what we call *letters* may seem to be weakened, and perhaps such is the case at this moment, but those who hold fast to them will have their reward and the world will always in the end come round again to their way of thinking

I have a son, my only son, at this moment in Australia. He is in the Union Bank at Melbourne. He was idle at Oxford, and I sent him to Melbourne that he might learn what regular work was. I have excellent reports of him from the authorities of his Bank, and he is very popular in Melbourne society too, but he wants to come home and says that a clerk in a Bank has no future in Australia any more than in England. It is not likely that he will be at Sydney, but if ever you are at Melbourne, I wish you would go and see him. I am uncertain what to do about bringing him home.

Believe me,

truly yours,

Matthew Arnold

R. D. Adams Esq

Pains Hill Cottage,
Cobham,
Surrey

October 28th, 1882

My dear Sir,

I should find much to interest me in Australia, but I have not at present any intention of going there. How the report got into the newspapers I don't know. The project of a visit to America has been before me several times, but is not likely to be realised—at present at any rate. Indeed so long as I continue to inspect schools, it would be extremely difficult for me to get the time necessary for a visit to America, still more, for a visit to the Colonies in Australia.

Thank you much for your kind letter and instructions, all the same. If ever I do come to Sydney, you may rely upon it that one of my first visits will be to you.

Believe me,

Sincerely yours,

Matthew Arnold

R. D. Adams Esq

IAN A. GORDON

University of New Zealand, Wellington

REVIEWS

Benserade and His Ballets de Cour. By CHARLES I. SILIN.
Baltimore The Johns Hopkins Press, 1940. Pp. 435. \$3.00.

It is attested by his contemporaries that Isaac de Benserade (1612-1691) was a very popular personage for the generation in which he lived. But his reputation faded rapidly during his last years and after his death. Historians of French literature have given him but scant attention. To most students and to many teachers he is hardly more than a rather frequently recurring name in the history of French Literature. Professor Silin has undertaken to fill in "this lacuna" and has succeeded admirably.

In his time there was considerable discussion as to the nobility of the poet's family. The situation is suggested by Bayle in his *Dictionnaire Critique* *Quoi qu'il en soit des ancêtres, l'obscurité du père ne peut point passer pour douteuse.* In such cases "the obscurity of a father" was *un pesant fardeau*. At any rate the poet's baptismal record shows that he was *filz de noble homme*, Henry de Benserade, *gentilhomme*. He was then one of a noble family which had lost its prestige.

The life of Benserade is treated in four chapters (Pp. 19-167): Early years; the Court poet; the Academician, the Last years. Richelieu, who seems to have been a relative of the poet's mother, gave him a pension of six hundred *livres* to enable him to continue his education and prepare him for an ecclesiastical career. It proved to be an unprofitable investment if that was its main purpose. Benserade was more interested in other things. He seems to have earned the comment of Chapelain that he was a man "of little learning" but "of much wit." The rapidly growing enthusiasm for the theater and the charms of an actress led him to compose a comedy and several tragedies and tragi-comedies which were moderately successful. It may be worthy of note that a poet of Benserade's temperament should have made an apparent effort to conform to the rules of dramatic composition which were then coming into vogue. However, he was not long in concluding that the drama was not the genre for him and that light verse in which he amused and flattered the noble lords and ladies was a more profitable as well as a more congenial occupation. Henceforth he played in the salons and the court a rôle which recalls that of Voiture at the Hôtel de Rambouillet, at which he was also a quite frequent guest.

Not long after the death of Richelieu, the poet won the favor of the queen mother who found him not only amusing but useful

for many things. She bestowed upon him a pension of 3,000 *livres*. Mazarin was even more lavish in his protection. Meanwhile his occasional verses and the discussion aroused by the debate on the relative merits of his sonnet *Job* and that of *Uranie*, composed some eighteen years before by Voiture, added greatly to his fame as a poet. He became a member of the French Academy in 1674, was twice elected director and once chancellor and seems to have taken his duties as an Academician quite seriously. His predecessor was Chapelain, whose fame as a poet had been devastated by the publication of his much heralded epic, *La Pucelle*. Benserade experienced a somewhat similar *débâcle* in 1676 with the publication of his *Métamorphoses d'Ovide en Rondeaux*.

The second part of Professor Silin's study (Pp. 171-404) is concerned with the *Ballets de Cour*. An introduction (Pp. 117-204) traces the development of the genre prior to the advent of Benserade. As their vogue increased, some attempts were made at producing a *poetica* for these compositions, but it was rarely observed and produced but little effect. The ballet was characterized as a *comédie muette* in which the general theme is presented in a *récit*, or *récits*, and the personality of the dancers by *vers de personnages*, i. e., verses which were recited while the dancers interpreted them by their costumes and their dancing. It was in the composition of these *récits* and especially of the *Vers de personnages* that Benserade shone. His talent for flattery was very highly developed and the audacity with which he "portrayed idiosyncrasies, ambitions, intrigues and weaknesses of the person dancing" is amazing.

A chapter is devoted to each of the twenty-four *Ballets* to which Benserade contributed more or less of the libretto for the *récits* and *les vers des personnages*. These chapters present all the information that was available to the author regarding the date of performance, and, in short, all those who had any part in the production.

It is interesting to note that some times the *Ballet* deals with realia. So, for example, in the *Ballet royal de la Nuit*, the audience saw "weary hunters returning with their bags full of game, shepherds and shepherdesses driving their flocks to town, bandits robbing an itinerant pedlar, . . . cripples and thugs discarding their make-up in the Cour des miracles, etc." "The *Ballet royal de l'Impatience* was organized for the purpose of allaying the court's impatience with the prolonged and continued delay in the completion of the Tulleries theater." The story of the Ballet royal d'Alcidiane was taken from a contemporary novel, the *Polexandre* by Gomberville. In general the themes or *récits* which are taken from antiquity are the most elaborate in their composition and in their *mise en scène*. The king danced in almost all of them, representing more than sixty different characters, objects, or ideas,

often in the form of proverbs. So, for example, in the *Ballet des Plaisirs, dansé par sa Majesté . . . divisé en deux parties dont la première contient les Délices de la campagne et la seconde les divertissements de la ville*, the king performed as *un Berger, un Egyptien, un Débauché, le Génie de la Danse*. Many of the most distinguished lords and ladies of his court were proud to follow his example.

In verses written to be applied to such performers there was bound to be a great deal of rather cloying flattery. But this is balanced by realistic comment upon topics of the day and "delicate allusions" to the ambitions and intrigues of those who occupied high places. Thanks to these qualities the *Ballets* of Benserade present much material that is important for those who are interested in the history of Louis XIV and his court.

COLBERT SEARLES

The University of Minnesota

German Dramatists of the 19th Century, F. W. KAUFMANN, Los Angeles, Lymanhouse, 1940, \$3.50.

Kaufmann macht den interessanten Versuch, die Geschichte des deutschen Dramas im neunzehnten Jahrhundert aus der Geschichte der Philosophie—genauer genommen aus dem Verfall des Idealismus und dem Aufstieg des Materialismus zu deuten. Ein kurzer Überblick über die Entwicklung der deutschen Philosophie seit der Aufklärung leitet die Darstellung ein, an die sich acht mehr oder weniger voneinander unabhängige Kapitel anschließen, in denen die Werke der hervorragendsten Dramatiker der Zeit, von Kleist bis Ibsen, auf ihren philosophischen Gehalt hin untersucht werden.

Um es klar und deutlich vorweg zu sagen. Kaufmann hat ein ungewöhnlich gutes Buch vorgelegt, ein Verdienst, das auch die folgenden Bemerkungen in keiner Weise herabsetzen wollen. Das von ihm entworfene Bild des deutschen Dramas ist faszinierend und ausserordentlich anregend, wenn auch der Leser von Kapitel zu Kapitel mehr überzeugt wird, dass die hier versuchte Deutung nur eine unter vielen Deutungen sein kann. Der ideengeschichtliche Gehalt im Werk eines Kleist etwa ist ja nicht derselbe wie im Werk eines Hebbel. Die Entwicklung des philosophischen Grundproblems in der Geschichte des Dramas verfolgen, heisst, auf die individuelle Breite und Tiefe der dichterischen Werke zugunsten einer Teilansichten verzichten. Eine Interpretation, die die Realität als einen konstanten Faktor annimmt und die Eigenart des Dichters lediglich an seinem Verhalten zu dieser Konstanten ablesen will, übersieht, dass die Realität des Dichters nicht die

Realität des Philosophen (das "Nicht-Ich") ist, dass der Dichter die Wirklichkeit nur in ihren zufälligen Formen, in den von ihm tatsächlich erlebten Aspekten zum Gegenstand seiner Dichtung machen kann. Es ist unmöglich, im Denkprozess die primäre Quelle dichterischen Schaffens suchen zu wollen.

Kaufmann hat sich daher durch die von ihm gewählte Problemstellung die Aussicht auf den individuellen Charakter der Dichterpersonlichkeiten vielfach verstellt. Er trägt die Masstabe von aussen heran, anstatt sie aus dem seelischen Zentrum des Werkes abzuleiten. Das Ergebnis ist eine gewisse Uniformität, die noch durch den etwas mechanisch-gleichförmigen Aufbau der Kapitel verstärkt wird. Als Beispiel sei nur auf ein Stück wie Buchners *Leonce und Lena* (nicht *Leonore und Lena* wie es im Buch irrtümlich heisst) hingewiesen, an dem man deutlich sehen kann, wo die Methode des Verfassers versagen musste. Aber auch in der Analyse von Grillparzers *Sappho* etwa begnügt er sich mit der Aufdeckung des Zwiespaltes von Handlung und Nicht-Handlung, ohne nach dessen Motivierung in der Erlebnisgeschichte des Dichters zu suchen.

Auf der anderen Seite hatte man wünschen mögen, dass der Verfasser die Darstellung des deutschen Dramas noch durch eine Reihe von Sammelkapiteln ergänzt hatte, in denen auch die untergeordneten Dichter zu Worte gekommen waren. Denn so richtig es ist, dass ein Dichter niemals mit einer Schule oder Bewegung identifiziert werden kann, dass die "Stromungen" in keinem Falle den Fluss der Geschichte als Ganzes darstellen, so richtig ist es doch auch, dass ein Gebirge mehr ist als nur das Nebeneinander seiner höchsten Gipfel. Eine Darstellung des Schicksalsdramas und des Wiener Volksstückes zum Beispiel—um nur einige solcher Gruppen herauszugreifen—hatte die Untersuchung abgerundet und wesentlich vervollständigt.

Die Kürze des zur Verfügung stehenden Raumes macht es unmöglich, die positiven Seiten des Buches ebenso ausführlich zu behandeln wie die negativen. Aus der Problemstellung des Verfassers ergeben sich—trotz aller Bedenken, die man haben muss—viele neue und zwingende Gesichtspunkte, die an sich schon genügen, ein Buch wertvoll erscheinen zu lassen. Ausserdem muss betont werden, dass es sich hier keineswegs nur um eine "kühne Verallgemeinerung" handelt (den schlimmsten Ausdruck, den man heute in einer Kritik benutzen konnte!), sondern um eine Schau, die aus grosser Sachkenntnis gewachsen ist. Das Buch wird zur Diskussion herausfordern—und damit mehr erreichen als viele andere Publikationen über denselben Gegenstand.

WOLFGANG PAULSEN

Southwestern College,
Memphis, Tennessee

George Eliot and John Chapman, With Chapman's Diaries. By GORDON S. HAIGHT. Illustrated. New Haven. Yale University Press, 1940. Pp xvi + 261. \$2.75.

As the twentieth century advances, the "Victorian Period" can be seen more and more in perspective and also more and more in detail. For the intimate papers of many a family are being opened up to the eyes of scholarship and new light is cast on many a figure of the near past. The author of *George Eliot and John Chapman* has not only printed in full the diaries of Dr Chapman for 1851 and 1860, but has, in 120 pages, traced the career of that strange philanderer-moralist. After an adventurous youth he took over the business of a publisher of "radical" books in 1844 and in 1847 settled with his long-suffering wife and their two children at the famous "142 Strand." Here he and Mrs. Chapman kept numerous boarders (mostly of the female sex) and gave frequent evening parties where were to be met many of the less conventional literary folk of the day. In October, 1851, he purchased the *Westminster Review* and continued as its editor until his death in 1894. After 1874 he lived in Paris, where he practiced as a physician, chiefly among foreign guests at the hotels, and, as in London, kept open house for the radicals of the day, this time a cosmopolitan group, French, English, and American. Of his career as a physician Mr. Haight says that it is "open to a strong suspicion of quackery," of his character, that it presents a "baffling paradox" of "vanity and humility, shrewdness and generosity, quackery and zeal for reform," of his work as a publisher, that it "exerted a stimulating influence upon English thought."

To most students Mr. Haight's book will be chiefly notable for its revelation of the connection between this strange personality and the woman who was to achieve fame as "George Eliot." During a stay as boarder at 142 Strand early in 1851 she fell into a half-intellectual, half-emotional, relationship with the practiced philanderer and parted from him in tears after stormy sessions with his wife, Susanna, and his mistress, Elizabeth. She took refuge with her devoted friends in Coventry, the Brays, but she had felt the fascination of London and of a career of her own. Dr. Chapman needed her and she returned to the Strand in September, 1851, to become the assistant editor of the *Westminster Review*. For two years she labored incessantly, but the darkness of fatigue and over-work was lightened by new acquaintance and new friendship. Mr. Haight gives the best account to be found anywhere of this period of George Eliot's life. It blinks nothing, but avoids the satirical tone that vitiates so much biographical work when the writer is "showing up" unsuspected corners of a supposedly well-known career. The treasures of the George Eliot Collection at Yale have been drawn on with thoroughness and taste. In the

pages of this book we are shown a Marian Evans who is serious and hard working, eager and passionate, and still young enough to be taken in by a physically charming man. We see here the woman who was to write *Adam Bede* and *The Mill on the Floss*, not the wise sybil who looms in the denatured volumes of Cross's *Life*. No one who reads these pages can help looking forward with anticipation to Mr. Haight's edition of the correspondence between the Brays, Miss Hennell, and their friend who was to become "George Eliot."

ANNA T. KITCHEL

Vassar College

BRIEF MENTION

Literary Criticism, Plato to Dryden. By ALLAN H. GILBERT. New York American Book Co., 1940. Pp. ix + 704. \$4.00. Professor Gilbert's anthology of literary criticism is no simple collection of fragments from great critics. It is, in a way, a documentary history of literary taste, or better, a documentary history of the taste of literary critics. Confining itself to theories of poetry, and after all poetry is the one literary form which goes back to antiquity, and to those writers who "spoke for the future rather than the past," it could not illustrate that conflict in standards which orients taste and makes artistic innovation comprehensible. The writer of this notice has not been able to understand why the future is any more important than the past or why one's own present is not a sufficient audience for any writer. He is also unable to accept the theory of "eternal principles." But that does not blind him to the fact that Professor Gilbert, whatever his aesthetic philosophy, has produced one of the most useful volumes in his field that has come from the press. It contains material that is inaccessible in many university libraries and an index which ties together the various selections and gives the book a unity which most anthologies unfortunately lack.

Especial attention should be invited to the new translation of Aristotle's *Poetics*, Heywood's *Apology for Actors*, the selections from critics of the Italian Renaissance, and the excellent introductory paragraphs to each critic.

GEORGE BOAS

Johns Hopkins University

John Bale: A Study in the Minor Literature of the Reformation. By JESSE W. HARRIS. Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, vol. xxv, no. 4. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1940. Pp. 160. Cloth, \$2.00, paper, \$1.50. Professor Harris traces Bale's life and his connections with the German and English Reformations and (less distinctly) with humanism. The problem of dating the plays is carried considerably beyond the point where Mr. J. H. P. Pafford left it in the Malone Society edition of *Kynge Johan*, and their significance as documents in the Cromwellian interest is cogently set forth. The new dating controverts Sir Edmund Chambers's view of Bale's indebtedness to Lyndsay and Kirchmayer. The scheme of organization involves too much repetition; but few, if any, students of Tudor drama will fail to find some of their perceptions sharpened by this monograph. There is a fourteen-page bibliography, besides an index. H. S.

Annals of English Drama, 975-1700. By ALFRED HARBAGE. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1940. Pp. viii + 264. \$3.00. Preceded by a list of medieval pieces, the catalogue of Renaissance plays begins with Medwall's *Nature* (c. 1495) and proceeds, year by year, to give author, title, limits for date of first performance, type, auspices (*e g.*, unacted, closet, Admiral's), and dates of first and latest editions. Two short supplementary lists include plays that could not be handled in the main chronology. Then come indexes of English playwrights, English plays, foreign playwrights, foreign plays translated or adapted, dramatic companies, and theaters. Finally, an appendix lists play MSS. This handy volume is a soundly planned and carefully executed aid to drama students, whose thanks Professor Harbage richly deserves. His assertion is well founded that "simply leafing the pages should prove suggestive, for a great deal of dramatic history in outline will unfold." H. S.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE GOTHIC QUEST. It is, of course, quite open to Professor Bernbaum (*MLN*, LV [1940], 64) to have his own opinion regarding my differentiation in *The Gothic Quest* of eighteenth-century historical fiction from later historical fiction, and he is perfectly entitled to consider that my treatment of the subject is vain, but on the other hand I am equally at liberty not to accept Gerhard Buck's classification of "historisierende Romane" and the "historische Romane" which (Buck thinks) Sir Walter Scott was the first to write. It does not follow at all that because I do not agree with and did not quote Buck I am ignorant of his "Die Vorge-

schichte des historischen Romans in der modernen englischen Literatur" Professor Bernbaum has no grounds for the suggestion, very plainly made, that I write about Prévost without having read this author, and that I am ignorant of the Prévost authorities and biographers. Although he refrains from directly discussing it, Professor Bernbaum makes reference to the perplexity concerning the publication of *Tales of Wonder* and *Tales of Terror*. It is only recently that this difficulty has been satisfactorily and finally cleared up, and if he will turn to my *Gothic Bibliography* (1940), pp. 525-27, he will find the facts set out in amplest detail, and that, I hasten to add, not by myself, but by an authority he will hardly venture to question. Professor Bernbaum is mistaken in supposing that Eino Railo and Jakob Brauchli are in any sense my predecessors. Railo's *Haunted Castle* was published in 1927, and Brauchli's *Der Englische Schauerroman um 1800* in 1928. I had written on the Gothic novel at least ten years before Railo's book appeared. The reason why I so strongly take exception to Railo and Brauchli being regarded as my predecessors will be apparent to those who know *The Haunted Castle* and *Der Englische Schauerroman um 1800*, or who glance at contemporary reviews of these books. No doubt it will afford great satisfaction to these two gentlemen to learn that they are admired by Professor Bernbaum, but he is (I fear) alone in his opinion of their merits. I would observe that remarks upon "eccentric notions" and "prejudices" are personalities and impertinent, having no sort of connection with criticism. Professor Bernbaum's concluding paragraph is so very cryptic that I cannot pretend to understand it, and therefore I am unable to reply to it. In theology it is permissible to differ from a great authority, even from a Doctor of the Church, provided that the dissenting opinion be well founded and put forward *modeste, sine petulantia, graviter*. In literary appreciation it is permissible to differ *modeste* from Coleridge—or even from Professor Bernbaum.

MONTAGUE SUMMERS

Richmond, Surrey, England

APHRA BEHN AND MONTFLEURY. Although thirty years ago when I was editing Mrs. Aphra Behn (III, 97), I remarked in reference to *The False Count* upon the galley scenes in *Les Fourberies de Scapin* and *Le Pédant joué*, more recently, *Notes and Queries*, CLIX (no. 16, Oct. 18, 1930), 274-5, I pointed out in ample detail that Mrs. Behn's comedy is "taken wholesale from Antoine Montfleury's *L'Ecole des Jaloux, ou le Cocu volontaire*," which in the eighteenth century was sometimes played as *La Fausse Turque*. It is distinctly unfortunate that my article should have escaped the notice of Mr. Ernst G. Mathews, since it renders his note in *MLN.*, LIV (June, 1939), 438-9, rather superfluous. Moreover, Mr. Mathews' reference to my edition of Mrs. Behn (III, 97) does not now hold good.

MONTAGUE SUMMERS

Richmond, Surrey, England

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received]

Alexander, Henry.—The story of our language *Toronto* Thomas Nelson, [1940] Pp. x + 242 \$1 40

Behre, Frank (ed.)—Thomas Castelford's chronicle 2 vols *Goteborg* Wettergren and Kerbers, 1940 Pp. xvi + 274, 156 Kr. 15 (*Goteborgs Hogskolas Arsskrift*, xlv, 2)

Bentley, Gerald Eades.—The Jacobean and Caroline stage, dramatic companies and players 2 vols *Oxford*: Clarendon Press [New York Oxford U Press], 1941. Pp. xx + 342, vi + 406 \$12 50

Berwick, Donald M.—The reputation of Jonathan Swift, 1781-1882 *Philadelphia, Pa.* [no publisher], 1941. Pp. vi + 170

Booth, Bradford A. and Jones, Claude E.—A concordance of the poetical works of Edgar Allan Poe *Baltimore, Md.*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1941 Pp. xiv + 211 \$5 50

Brooks, Richard Albert Edward (ed.)—The diary of Michael Floy, Jr., Bowery Village, 1833-1837 With introductory note, annotations, and postscript by Margaret Floy Washburn. *New Haven, Conn.* Yale U Press, 1941 Pp. xii + 270 \$5 00 (*Vassar College Anniversary Publication*)

Cameron, Kenneth Walter—Authorship and sources of "Gentleness and Nobility," a study in early Tudor drama, together with a text of the play based on the black-letter original *Raleigh, N. C.* Thistle Press, 1941. Pp. 132 \$2 75

—The background of John Heywood's "Witty and Witless," a study in early Tudor drama, together with a specialized bibliography of Heywood scholarship. *Raleigh, N. C.* Thistle Press, 1941. Pp. 46 \$1 25

—John Heywood's "Play of the Wether," a study in early Tudor drama. *Raleigh, N. C.* Thistle Press, 1941. Pp. 65. \$1 75

Carmony, Francis J.—An X-ray study of pharyngeal articulation *Berkeley, Calif.*: U of Calif Press, 1941 Pp. 10 \$0 25. (U. of Calif Pubs in Mod Philol., xxi, 5)

Cragie, William A.—The growth of American English, II *Oxford*: Clarendon Press [New York Oxford U Press], 1940. Pp. 41. \$1 25 [S P E Tract, lvii]

Crofts, J.—Wordsworth and the seventeenth century. Warton lecture on English poetry, British Academy, 1940 *London*: Humphrey Milford [New York. Oxford U.

Press], 1940 Pp. 20. 1 sh. 6 d. or \$0 60. (From the proceedings of the British Academy, xxvi)

Duthie, George Ian—The 'bad' quarto of *Hamlet*, a critical study *Cambridge*: University Press [New York: Macmillan], 1941 Pp. xi + 279 \$2 25 (Shakespeare Problems, vi)

Dyer, John.—Giongar Hill Ed with intro and notes by Richard C. Boys *Baltimore, Md.* Johns Hopkins Press, 1941. Pp. xiv + 114. \$1 75

Fechter, Charles, Howe, Julia Ward, Hazelton, George C., Mitchell, Langdon, De Mille, William C.—*Monte Cristo* (James O'Neill's version), and other plays. *Princeton, N. J.*: Princeton U Press, 1941. Pp. vi + 360. \$5 00 (*America's Lost Plays*, xvi.)

Fifteen poets—*Oxford*. Clarendon Press [New York Oxford U Press], 1941 Pp. xiv + 503 \$1 45. [1000 lines from each of the major English poets from Chaucer to Arnold, with brief introductions by C. S. Lewis, Tillyard, Dobree, Tiltson, Sutherland, Auden, Blunden, Macneice, Garrod, and others]

Foster, Finley M. K. and Watt, Horner A. (eds.)—Voices of liberty *New York*: Macmillan, 1941 Pp. xii + 613 \$1 50. [An attractive anthology for college courses in composition essays, biographies, short stories; one third English, the rest American]

Funke, Otto.—Die fruhzeit der englischen grammatik *Bern*. Herbert Lang, 1941 Pp. 91 Fr. 7 50 (*Schriften der literarischen gesellschaft Bern*, iv)

Gettmann, Royal A.—Turgenev in England and America *Urbana, Ill.* U of Ill Press, 1941 Pp. 196. \$1 50 and \$2 00 (*Ill Studies in Lang and Lit*, xxvii, 2)

Gollancz, Sir Israel (ed.)—Sir Gawain and the green knight re-edited from MS Cotton Nero, A x, in the British Museum. *London*: Humphrey Milford [New York Oxford U Press], 1940 Pp. lxxii + 186 \$3 25 (*Early English Text Society, Original Series*, 210)

Hankins, John Erskine.—"The character of Hamlet" and other essays *Chapel Hill, N. C.* U of N C Press, 1941 Pp. xii + 264 \$3 00.

Hart, James D.—The Oxford companion to American literature *New York*: Oxford U Press, 1941 Pp. viii + 888 \$5 00

Heywood, John—"Gentleness and Nobility" (1522-1523), originally edited with a philosopher's epilogue by John Rastell. Whole now re-edited from black-letter original, by Kenneth W. Cameron. *Raleigh, N. C.* Thistle Press, 1941 Pp. 36. \$0 75

Hilbish, Florence M. A.—Charlotte Smith, poet and novelist (1749-1806). *Philadelphia, Pa.* U of Pa, 1941. Pp. x + 634

Hintz, Howard W.—Thomas Wentworth Higginson disciple of the newness (an abridgment) *New York* N. Y. U., 1939 Pp. ii + 16

Joughin, G. Louis.—Basic reference forms, a guide to established practice in bibliography quotations, footnotes, and thesis format *New York*: Crofts, 1941 Pp. xii + 94 \$0.80

King, Arthur H.—The language of satirized characters in *Poetaster*, a socio-stylistic analysis, 1597-1602 *Lund* Gleerup, [1941] Pp. xxxiv + 258 10 Kr. (Lund Studies in English, x.)

Lydenberg, Harry M. and Keogh, Andrew (eds.).—William Warner Bishop, a tribute, 1941 *New Haven, Conn.* Yale U Press, 1941 Pp. vi + 204 \$3.00

Matthiessen, F. O.—American Renaissance, art and expression in the age of Emerson and Whitman *New York* Oxford U Press, 1941. Pp. xxvi + 678 \$5.00

Mendell, Clarence W.—Our Seneca *New Haven, Conn.* Yale U Press, 1941 Pp. x + 285 \$3.00

Moore, Samuel and Knott, Thomas A.—The elements of Old English, elementary grammar, reference grammar, and reading selections. *Ann Arbor, Mich.* George Wahr, 1940 Pp. viii + 337 (Eighth edition)

Norwood, J. E.—Concerning words, a manual and workbook Revised edition *New York* Prentice-Hall, 1941 Pp. vi + 89 \$0.95

Paine, Clarence S.—The comedy of manners (1660-1700), a reference guide to the comedy of the Restoration *Boston* Faxon, 1941 Pp. 51 (Reprinted from the Bulletin of Bibliography, xvii, 2, ff.)

Richardson, Lyon N.—Henry James, representative selections, with introduction, bibliography, and notes *New York*: American Book Co., [1941] Pp. cxxii + 490 \$1.25 (American Writers Series)

Sampson, George.—The concise Cambridge history of English literature *Cambridge*: University Press [New York: Macmillan], 1941. Pp. xvi + 1094 \$4.50

Spargo, John Webster (comp.).—A bibliographical manual for students of language and literature of England and United States Second edition *Chicago, Ill.*: Packard, [1941] Pp. x + 260 \$1.50

Stamm, Rudolf.—Der umstrittene Ruhm Alexander Popes *Bern* A. Francke, 1941 Pp. 116 Fr. 6.50 (Swiss Studies in English, 12)

Stone, John A., Steele, Silas S., Clinch, Charles P., Field, Joseph M., Conway, H. J. (?), Wilkins, John H., Jones, Joseph S., and Brougham, John — *Metamora*, and other plays Ed. Eugene R. Page *Princeton, N. J.*:

Princeton U Press, 1941 Pp. viii + 399 \$5.00 (America's Lost Plays, xiv)

Thomas, Wright and Brown, Stuart Gerry. Reading poems, an introduction to critical study *New York* Oxford U Press, 1941 Pp. xiv + 781 \$2.75

Thomson, S. Harrison — Progress of medieval and renaissance studies in the United States and Canada, Bulletin no. 16 *Boulder, Colorado* U of Colorado, 1941 Pp. 132 \$0.50

Wellek, René.—The rise of English literary history *Chapel Hill, N. C.* U of N. C. Press, 1941 Pp. xii + 275 \$3.00

Willey, Basil.—The eighteenth century background, studies on the idea of nature in the thought of the period *New York* Columbia U Press, 1941 Pp. viii + 302 \$3.25

Wilson, Edmund, Foerster, Norman, Ransom, John Crowe, Auden, W. H.—The intent of the critic Edited by Donald A. Stauffer *Princeton, N. J.* Princeton U Press, [1941] Pp. vi + 147 \$2.50

Wimsatt, W. K., Jr.—The prose style of Samuel Johnson *New Haven, Conn.*: Yale U Press, 1941 Pp. xvi + 166 \$3.00 (Yale Studies in English, 94)

Young, Charles Lowell.—Emerson's Montaigne *New York*. Macmillan, 1941 Pp. xii + 236 \$2.50 (Wellesley College Publication)

Young, Malcolm.—Paul Elmer More, a bibliography *Princeton, N. J.* Princeton U Press, 1941. Pp. viii + 40. \$0.50

GERMAN

Augustin, Hermann.—Goethes und Stiffers Nausikaa-Tragodie. über d. Urphänomene *Basel* Schwabe, 1941 91 pp. Fr. 3.50

Baur, Arthur.—Das Adjektiv in Notkers Boethius Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung seiner Verhältnisse zur lateinischen Vorlage *Diss. Zurich*: Lang, 1940 60 pp.

Behrens, Walter.—Karl Rottger über das lyrische, epische und dramatische Schaffen des Dichters Diss. Jena *Würzburg-Aumühle*. K. Triltsch, 1939 99 pp.

Beiträge zur Flurnamenforschung Eugen Fehrle zum 60. Geburtstag dargebracht Hrsg. von Herbert Derwein *Karlsruhe*: Südwestdeutsche Druck- u. Verlagsges. [1940] 163 pp. M. 4.80

Benedix, Peter.—Der Weg der Lena Christ. *Wien*: Luser [1940] 236 pp. M. 4.80

Benz, Richard.—Goethe und die romantische Kunst. Mit 40 Bildtafeln. *München*: Piper [1940] 253 pp. M. 8.80

Bornmüller, Fritz.—Die Flurnamen Ober- und Niederrosbachs *Diss. Marburg*. [Hessisches Flurnamenbuch H. 16] *Marburg*: Elwert, 1940. 58 pp. 2 maps. M. 3.

Brendle, Erich—Die Tragik im deutschen Drama vom Naturalismus bis zur Gegenwart Diss Tübingen *Nurtingen a N*: Henzler, 1940 246 pp

Burkle, Veit [d. i. Karl Heim Bischoff]—Schiller (1-5 Tsd.) [Die Dichter der Deutschen Folge 4] *Stuttgart*: Cotta [1940] 102 pp M 150

Cores, Franz—Die Flurnamen der Gemarkungen Eicherscheid, Hammer und Huppenbroich Ein Beitrag zur geschichtlichen Auswertung der Flurnamen (Diss Köln) [Veröffentlichung des Instituts für geschichtliche Landeskunde der Rheinlande an der Univ Bonn] *Bonn*: Rohrscheid, 1940. xi, 170 pp., 1 plate, 4 maps M 580.

Deknatel, Roelof—Wilhelm Busch, der lachende Philosoph des Pessimismus Diss Groningen *Rotterdam* Wyt, 1940 195 pp 1 leaf

Denewa, Wena St.—Das österreichische Marchendrama in der Biedermeierzeit Diss München [Theater u Drama Bd 15] *Berlin* Elsner Verlagsges 1940 114 pp M 480

Dziobek, Wilma—Problemgeschichtliches zur mittelhochdeutschen Epik Ulrichs von Eschenbach Diss Breslau *Gorlitz*: Hoffmann & Reibel, 1940 100 pp, 7 plates

Eckhardt, Karl August—Ingwi und die Ingweonen in der Überlieferung des Nordens 2 neubearb Aufl [Germanenstudien, H 1 = Schriften d. Deutschrechtl Instituts] *Bonn*: Rohrscheid [1940] 96 pp 1 map M 550

Ernst, Paul—Volker und Zeiten im Spiegel ihrer Dichtung Aufsätze zur Weltliteratur Hrg v Karl August Kutzbach *München*: Albert Langen, 1940 407 pp M 10

Fehse, Wilhelm—Karl Leberecht Immermann Ein Lebensbild Hrg von der Stadt Magdeburg [Magdeburger Kultur- und Wirtschaftsleben Nr 21] *Magdeburg* Trommler-Druck, 1940. 78 pp 18 plates M 180

Gass, Karl-Eugen—Die Idee der Volksdichtung und die Geschichtsphilosophie der Romantik (Zur Interpretation des Briefwechsels zwischen den Brüdern Grimm und Achim von Arnim) [Kaiser Wilhelm-Institut f. Kunst u Kulturwissenschaft, Rom Veröffentlichungen d. Abt f Kulturwissenschaft Reihe 1, H 19/20] *Wien*: A Schroll & Co., 1940 46 pp M 1.60

Gray, J. Glenn—Hegel's Hellenic Ideal *New York*: King's Crown Press, 1941. viii, 104 pp \$1 50

Günther, Adolf—Der sudetendeutsche Volkstumskampf im Spiegel des Grenzlandromans Diss Marburg. [Das Buch im Kulturleben der Völker Bd 3] *Wurzburg*: Triltsch, 1940 123 pp M 3

Heitmann, Hans—Theodor Storm (1-5 Tsd.) [Die Dichter der Deutschen Folge 4] *Stuttgart* Cotta [1940]. 93 pp M 150

Hermann, Eduard—"Jeder einzelne" in den germanischen Sprachen [Nachrichten von d. Ges d. Wiss zu Göttingen. Philol.-hist Kl Fachgr 4, N F Bd 3, Nr 7]. *Göttingen*: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1940 Pp 173-206 M 2.

Heyne, Marga—Das dichterische Schrifttum der Mark Brandenburg bis 1700 Eine Bucherkunde [Brandenburgische Jahrbücher Jg 1939, No 13] *Potsdam u Berlin*. Hayn's Erben [1940] 116 pp 4° M 125

Hille, Hermann—Die Mundart des nördlichen Harzvorlandes, insbesondere des Huygebietes Hrg vom Harzverein f Geschichte u Altertumskunde Diss Hamburg [Forschungen zur Geschichte des Harzgebietes 7] *Quedlinburg*: Huch in Komm 1939. xv, 127 pp. M 250

Hoier, G.—Altes und mundartliches Sprachgut der Heimat [Aus Rossbacher Zeitung, 1937] 64 pp

Ihlenfeld, Kurt—Freund Ham Todesweisheit und Lebenskunst bei Matthias Claudius *Berlin-Steglitz*: Eckart-Verl 1940. 30 pp 75 Pf

Indogermanisches Jahrbuch. Im Auftrag der Indogerm Ges hrg von Hans Krahe Bd 24 = Jg 1940 (Bibliographie d J 1938) *Berlin* de Gruyter, 1940 457 pp M 28

Ineichen, Alfred—Luzerner Literatur. [Schriftenreihe der städtischen Sekundarlehrerschaft Schrift 1] *Luzern* Keller & Co [1940] 48 pp. Fr 1

Jahrbuch der Grabbe-Gesellschaft Bd 3. 1940 *Detmold*: [1940] 110 pp, 8 plates.

Joepchen, Paula—Die Gemahlin Friedrichs des Grossen Elisabeth Christine als Schriftstellerin Diss Köln 1940 46 pp.

Jost, Wilhelm—Die Namen der Gemarkung Erzhausen Diss Giessen [Hessisches Flurnamenbuch H 19] *Marburg*: Elwert, 1940 85 pp 2 plates M. 3

Karprolat, Richard—Chr D Grabbes Drama "Napoleon oder die hundert Tage." Eine Interpretation Diss Münster. [Schriftenreihe d. Grabbe-Gesellschaft Bd 2] *Detmold*. 1939 128 pp

Kaulhausen, Marie-Hed.—Die Typen des Sprechens und ihr Wert für die Sprecherziehung [Germanische Bibl Abt 2, Bd. 43] *Heidelberg*: Carl Winter, 1940. x, 67 pp, xxiv pp plates M 5.

Korff, H. A—Geist der Goethezeit Versuch einer ideellen Entwicklung der klassisch-romantischen Literaturgeschichte [3 Tle], Tl. 1 Sturm und Drang [Unveränderter Neudruck] *Leipzig*: J J Weber 1923 [1940] xii, 321 pp M 11.

Kraus, Carl von—Text und Entstehung von Rudolfs Alexander. [Sitzungsber. d. Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss. Philos-hist Abt Jg

1940, H 8] *München* C H Beck, 1940 91 pp M 570

Krause, Wolfgang.—Zu [Nachrichten von der Ges d Wiss zu Göttingen Philol-hist Kl Fachgr 4, N F. Bd 3, Nr 6] *Göttingen* Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1940 Pp 155-172 M 1

Lamprecht, Pfaffe.—Das Alexanderlied Das Rolandshed d Pfaffen Konrad Hsg von Friedrich Maurer [Deutsche Literatur Reihe Geistl Dichtung des Mittelalters, Bd 5] *Leipzig* Reclam, 1940 319 pp M 750

Lexer, Matthias.—Mittelhochdeutsches Taschenwörterbuch 22 überarb Aufl *Leipzig* Hirzel, 1940 viii, 343 pp M 8

Luis, Werner.—Das Baueintum im grenz- und volksdeutschen Roman der Gegenwart [Neue deutsche Forschungen Abt Neuere deutsche Literaturgeschichte, Bd 25] Diss *Münster*. *Berlin* Junker und Dunnhaupt, 1940 134 pp M 6

Lunding, Erik.—Das schlesische Kunstdrama Eine Darstellung u Deutung Diss *København* Haase, 1940 221 pp Kr 675.

Meckel, Eberhard.—Conrad Ferdinand Meyer (1-5 Tsd.) [Die Dichter der Deutschen Folge 4]. *Stuttgart* Cotta [1940] 94 pp M. 150

Meinerts, Hans Jürgen.—"Die Akten des Vogelsangs" Raabestunden auf Grund einer Sprachuntersuchung Diss *Göttingen* [Neue Forschung 35]. *Berlin* Junker u Dunnhaupt, 1940. 236 pp M. 10

Menck, Ursula.—Die Auffassung der Frau in den frühen moralischen Wochenschriften Diss. *Hamburg*. [Köln:] 1940 97 pp.

Menge, Gisbert, O. F. M.—Christusmystik der Dichterin Annette von Droste-Hülshoff Ein Blick in ihr Geistliches Jahr [Aus: Die Friedensstadt, 1938]. *Paderborn* [Winfried-Bund, 1938] 20 pp.

Mergell, Erika.—Die Frauenrede im deutschen Minnesang. Diss *Frankfurt*. *Limburg a d L*: Limburger Vereinsdruckerei, 1940 130 pp.

Merwart, Marianne.—Studien zu den Inselnamen der Nord- und Ostsee. Diss. [Aus. Aus Hansischem Raum Bd 12, Land u Leute. 1] *Hamburg*: 1940 Pp 137-187

Müller, Irmgard.—Saphir in München Eine Untersuchung über das Eindringen und den Einfluss jüdischer Journalisten in d. Münchener Pressewesen Diss *München* *Düsseldorf* Nolte, 1940 vii, 95 pp

Neumann, Elisabeth.—Studien zur "werlte" und zum "leben" in hofischer Dichtung Diss *Bonn*. *Bochum-Langendreer*: Pöppinghaus, 1940 xi, 84 pp

Novotny, Fritz.—Adalbert Stifter als Maler. Mit 99 Bildern u 7 Farbentafeln. [Sammlung Schroll] *Wien*: A Schroll & Co, 1940. 128 pp M. 8.50.

Ohly, Ernst Friedrich.—Sage und Legende in der Kaiserchronik Untersuchungen über Quellen und Aufbau der Dichtung [Forschungen zur deutschen Sprache und Dichtung H 10] *Münster* Aschendorff, 1940 xiv, 242 pp M 580

Pange, Pauline de.—August Wilhelm Schlegel und Frau von Stael Eine schicksalhafte Begegnung Nach unveröffentlichten Briefen eiz Deutsche Ausgabe von Willy Grabert *Hamburg* Goverts [1940] 496 pp. M 1250

Pletschette, Nic.—Der Luxemburger Dorfschuster Eine sprachlich-folkloristische Studie [Aus Vierteljahrsblätter Jg 1939, Nr 19 u 20] *Luxemburg* Worré-Mertens, 1939 30 pp 50 Pf

Prasser, Viktoria.—Die Sage von der Zukunftsschlacht am Baum Diss *Würzburg* [Germanische Studien H 224] *Berlin*: Ebering, 1940 204 pp M 750

Presser, Helmut.—Das Wort im Urteil der Dichter Beitrag zu einer Sinndeutung des dichterischen Wortes Diss *Bonn* [Bonner Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie, H 10] *Würzburg*. Triltsch, 1940 87 pp M 360

Prexl, Maria.—Wortgeographie des mittleren Böhmerwaldes Mit 78 Karten [Arbeiten zur sprachlichen Volksforschung in den Sudetenländern H 7] *Leipzig*: Rohrer [1939] xii, 63 pp. M 750

Psaar, Werner.—Schicksalsbegriff und Tragik bei Schiller und Kleist Diss [Germanische Studien H. 223]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1940 269 pp

Ramundfeier, Die, der Stadt Wien 1 bis 9 Juni 1940 Prolog, Festreden u Bericht *Wien*. Deutscher Verlag für Jugend u. Volk [1940] 83 pp, 6 plates

Roch, Herbert.—Richter ihrer Zeit. Grimmelshausen, Swift, Gogol. *Berlin*. Neff, 1940. 265 pp M 6

Roedemeyer, Friedrich Karl.—Die Sprache des Redners. *München*: Oldenbourg, 1940 191 pp M 650

Rompelmann, Tom Albert.—Der Wartburgkrieg [Der Sängerkrieg auf der Wartburg]. Kritisch hrsg Diss *Amsterdam* Paris, 1939. xii, 355 pp, 2 leaves

Ruttenauer, Isabella.—"Lichte Nacht" Weltangst und Erlösung in den Gedichten von Andreas Gryphius *Würzburg* Werkbund-Verl., Abt Die Burg, 1940 22 pp 70 Pf.

—Vom verborgenen Glauben in Eduard Morikes Gedichten *Würzburg*: Werkbund-Verl., Abt Die Burg, 1940 23 pp 70 Pf

Schmidt, Doris.—Der natürliche Mensch. Ein Versuch über Jeremias Gotthelf. Diss. [Giessener Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie 76]. *Giessen*: von Munchow, 1940 86 pp. M. 2.80

Schneider, Reinhold — "An den Engel in der Wüste" Die Wende Clemens Brentanos. [Zeugnis u. Auslegung]. *Wurzburg: Werkbund-Verl* 1940. 31 pp 75 Pf

— "Zur Zeit der Scheide zwischen Nacht und Tag" Der Lebenskampf der Dorothea. *Wurzburg: Werkbund-Verl, Abt. die Burg*, 1940 40 pp 85 Pf

— Der Pilger Eichendorffs Weltgefühl. [Zeugnis und Auslegung] *Wurzburg: Werkbund-Verl* 1940 28 pp 75 Pf.

— "Der Katarakt." Das Schicksal Nikolaus Lenaus [Zeugnis und Auslegung]. *Wurzburg: Werkbund-Verl*. 1940. 36 pp. 80 Pf

Scholler, Georg.—Laute und Flexion der Mundart von Bavendorf (Kreis Ravensburg) und Umgebung Diss. *Tubingen: Laupp*, 1939. 71 pp, 1 plate

Schott, Georg.—Goethes Faust in heutiger Schau *Stuttgart. Tazzelwurm* [1940]. 124 pp M 3 50

Schultz, Franz.—Die deutsche Romantik. [Schriften zur volkischen Bildung] *Köln: Schaffstein* [1940] 63 pp 40 Pf

Sotavalta, Arvo.—Zur Theorie der Lautveränderungen [Annales Academiae scientiarum Fennicae B, 43, 2]. *Helsinki*: 1938 178 pp Fmk. 90

— über die Struktur der Laute [Annales Academiae scientiarum Fennicae, B, 43, 1]. *Helsinki*: 1940 212 pp Fmk 110

Tappolet, Ernst — Zur Erinnerung an Herrn Professor Ernst Tappolet 1870-1939. [Basel: Zbinden & Hugon, 1939] 23 pp.

Ungar, Hans.—Der Aufbaustil in den Novellen Heinrich von Kleists. Diss. Jena. *Mühlbach, Rumanen*: Buchdruckerei Stella, 1940 136 pp

Winkel, Eva.—Die epische Charaktergestaltung bei Jean Paul Der Held der "Flegeljahre" Diss. [Dichtung, Wort u. Sprache Bd. 8]. *Hamburg*: 1940. 85 pp.

FRENCH

Barr, Mary-Margaret H. — Voltaire in America, 1744-1800 *Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press*, 1941. (J H. Studies, 39)

Baudin, Maurice.—The Profession of King in Seventeenth-Century Fr. Drama. *Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press*, 1941 110 pp \$1 25. (J H. Studies in R. L. L, 38)

Bestiaire d'amour rimé, le, poème inédit du XIII^es, publ. avec introd., notes et glossaire par Arvid Thordstein *Lund: Gleerup*, 1941. xcvi + 196 pp. (Etudes romanes de Lund, 2)

Daudet. — Tartarin de Tarascon, ed. Amateau, d'Arlon, Humbert *New York: Odyssey Press*, 1941. xii + 163 pp. \$0.80.

Dondo, M.—Modern French course, revised ed *Boston: Heath*, 1941. xii + 645 pp. \$1.92.

Galland, J. S. and Vaughan, Ethel.—Progressive Fr Grammar *New York: Macmillan*, 1941. xvi + 397 pp \$1 75

Gobel, Hélène.—A New Fr Reader Ceci et Cela *New York: Holt*, 1940. vi + 126 + xxviii pp \$0 96.

Guyer, F. E. and Bovée, A. G — Vingt Contes favoris *New York: Oxford U. Press*, 1941 viii + 425 pp. \$1 65

Harris, Julian.—Fr Reader for Beginners *New York: Holt*, 1940 xi + 355 + lxxx pp \$1 50

Houck, Margaret.—Sources of the *Roman de Brut* of Wace *Berkeley U of Cal Press*, 1941 196 pp. (U of Cal. Pubs in English, V, no. 2)

Hunt, H. J.—The Epic in Nineteenth-Century France Foreword by G. Rudler *Oxford: Blackwell*, 1941 xiv + 446 pp. 25 sh

Kettridge, J. O.—Handy Dictionary of the Fr and Eng Langs *Philadelphia: David McKay Co*, 1941. xiv + 526 pp

Lang, André. — L'Affaire Plantin, ed. Jeanne Guet and Marcel Vigneras. *New York. Dryden Press*, 1941 x + 188 pp. \$1.15

Lévêque, André.—Histoire de la civilisation fr *New York Holt*, 1940. viii + 576 pp. \$2 50.

Lowe, L. F. H.—Spoken French *New York: Holt*, 1940. 105 pp. \$1 00.

Marion, Séraphin.—Les Lettres canadiennes d'autrefois 2 v *Ottawa: Eds de l'Université*, 1939-40 187 + 193 pp.

Mason, A. H., 4th.—Fr. Theatre in N. Y., a list of plays, 1899-1939. Diss. *New York: Columbia U Press*, 1940. x + 443 pp

Moore, Mina J. — Charme de province, contes recueillis *Boston Heath*, 1941. 182 pp. \$1 05.

Nilsson-Ehle, H.—Les Adverbes en -ment compléments d'un verbe en fr. moderne. *Lund: Gleerup*, 1941. 242 pp (Etudes romanes de Lund, 3)

Pusey, W. W., III.—Louis Sébastien Mercier in Germany. *Columbia diss*, 1939 245 pp.

Rosenfield, L. C.—From Beast-Machine to Man-Machine. Diss. *New York: Columbia U Press*, 1940 xxviii + 355 pp

Saba, Jean.—Balzac as a Social Historian. Abstract of U. of Ill diss, 1941. 15 pp.

Savborg, Torsten.—Etude sur le rôle de la préposition *de* dans les expressions de lieu relatives en latin vulgaire et en ancien gallo-roman. *Upsala diss.*, 1941. 345 pp

Spache, Olga, Renée Tétart, George Spache. — Parlons français Premier Livre. A workbook for beginning French, illustrated by E. Santoro and C F. Wells 33 pp, typed. \$1.00.

Spagnoli, J. J.—The Social Attitude of Marcel Proust. Columbia diss. *New York*: Inst. of F. Studies (1936). viii + 172 pp.

Spink, G. W.—Jacques Lenormand et ses amis [Reader for children]. *Boston*: Heath, 1941. 105 pp. \$0.48.

Steinhauer, H. and Walter, F.—Omnibus of Fr. Lit. from the Renaissance to the End of the Nineteenth Century. 2 v. *New York*: Macmillan, 1941. 631 + 629 pp. \$7.00.

Stevens, L. C.—La Langue de Brantôme. *Paris*: Nizet et Bastard, 1939. 149 pp.

Tétart, R., Spache, O. and G.—Parlons français. Deuxième livre. A reader and workbook for beginning French, illustr. by E. Santoro and C. F. Wells. 71 pp., typed. \$1.00.

ITALIAN

Barbi, M.—Problemi di critica dantesca. Seconda serie (1920-37). *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1941. 479 pp.

Boccaccio, G.—L'Ameto. Lettere. Il Corbaccio. *Bari*: Laterza, 1940. (Scrittori d'Italia) 315 pp.

Croce, Alda (ed.)—Teatro italiano della seconda metà dell'Ottocento. Vol. I. I mariti di A. Torelli, Cause ed effetti di P. Ferrari; Chi sa il guoco non l'insegna di F. Martini. *Bari*: Laterza, 1940. 277 pp.

Gmelin, H.—Dantes Weltbild. *Leipzig*: Quelle u. Meyer, 1940. 120 pp.

Goggio, Emilio.—A New Italian Reader for Beginners. *Boston*: Heath, 1941. v + 220 pp. \$1.36.

Gresig, G.—Giovanni Vergas Kunst u. ihre Beziehungen zur Dichtung des franz. Realismus u. Naturalismus. Diss. *Breslau*: Bleicherode, Nieft, 1940. 114 pp.

Hall, Robert A.—Bibliography of Italian Linguistics (Special Publications of the Linguistic Society of America). *Baltimore*: Linguistic Society of America, 1941. 543 pp.

Kany, C. E. and Speroni, Ch.—Elementary Italian Conversation. *Boston*: Heath, 1941. 45 pp. \$0.32.

Lala, Fr.—Letteratura italiana del Novecento. *Milano*: Quaderni di poesia, 1940. 259 pp.

Niccodemi, Dario.—Il Poeta. Ed. with introduction and notes by E. I. Slater. *Boston*: Heath, 1941. 63 pp. \$0.36.

Russo, J. L.—Second Year Italian. *Boston*: Heath and Co., 1941. xvi + 621 pp.

Schiaffini, A.—Le origini della lingua poetica italiana. Appunti a cura di V. Pini e A. Roncaglia. *Roma*: Sansoni, 1940. 391 pp.

Torrielli, Andrew J.—Italian Opinion on America as Revealed by Italian Travelers, 1850-1900. *Cambridge*: Harvard University

Press, 1941. vi + 330 pp. \$3.50. (Harvard Studies in Romance Languages, 15.)

SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE

Allen, J. H. D., Jr.—Portuguese Word Formation with Suffixes. U. of Pa. diss., 1941. 143 pp.

Cabeza de Vaca, A. V.—Los Naufragios y relación, ed. J. E. Espinosa and E. A. Mercado. *Boston*: Heath, 1941. \$0.48.

Carruthers, B. F.—The Life, Work and Death of Plácido. Abstract of U. of Ill. diss., 1941. 15 pp.

Castillo & Sparkman—Volando por Sudamérica. *Boston*: Heath, 1941. \$0.32.

Castro, Américo—Iberoamérica, su presente y su pasado. *New York*: Dryden Press, 1941. xvi + 267 pp. \$1.65.

Centeno, A. and Salas, M.—Reunión en México. *New York*: Dryden Press, 1941. 186 pp. \$1.15.

Franco, Alberto.—La Leyenda, bosquejo de un estudio folklórico. *Buenos Aires*: Inst. de coop. universitaria, 1940. 40 pp.

Hills and Ford.—First Spanish Course, new ed. with collab. of G. Rivera. viii + 310 pp. \$1.56.

Keniston, H.—A Standard List of Sp. Words and Idioms. *Boston*: Heath, 1941. xiv + 108 pp. \$0.80.

—Learning Spanish. *New York*: Holt, 1940. xxv + 396 + xlix pp. \$1.60.

Leavitt, S. E. and Stoudemire, S. A.—Vámos a Leer! *New York*: Holt, 1938. xi + 237 + lviii pp. \$1.36.

Nichols, Madeline W.—A Bibliographical Guide to Materials on American Spanish. *Cambridge*: Harvard U. Press, 1941. xii + 114 pp.

Palacios, Eustaquio.—El Alférez real, ed. J. L. Martin. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1941. xviii + 205 pp. \$1.30.

Sánchez Galarra, G.—El Héroe, ed. V. A. Warren and J. O. Swain. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1941. xxii + 157 pp. \$1.20.

Shearer, J. F.—The Poética and Apéndices of Martínez de la Rosa. Princeton diss., 1941. xiv + 137 pp. (lithotyped).

GENERAL

Craig, Hardin (ed.)—Stanford Studies in Language and Literature. *Stanford U., Cal.*: 1941. vi + 387 pp.

Lind, L. R.—Medieval Latin Studies. Their Nature and Possibilities. *Lawrence, Kansas*: U. of Kansas, 1941. 48 pp. (U. of Kansas Pubs., 26.)

Southworth, S. D. and Chapman, J. M.—Banking Facilities for Bankless Towns. *New York*: Am. Economists Council, 1941. 76 pp.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LXI

DECEMBER, 1941

Number 8

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL DATA ON VOLTAIRE FROM 1931 TO 1940

The bibliography which follows is intended as a supplement to *A Century of Voltaire study a bibliography of writings on Voltaire, 1825 to 1925*, which was published in 1929, and also to "Bibliographical data on Voltaire from 1926 to 1930" which appeared in the May 1933 issue of *Modern Language Notes*. It is limited to books and articles about Voltaire and does not include editions of his works except in certain cases where there is considerable critical material. With the exception of several titles marked by an asterisk, all books and periodicals listed have been examined by the compiler. In a few instances, the name of a library follows the entry, indicating verification by correspondence. There are undoubtedly additional titles which have not been available, largely because of recent world events. Further information will be appreciated.

The classification of the material follows that used in the original bibliography with the following exceptions: Part III has not been subdivided, Part IV has only two subdivisions, and in Part VI, the items have been arranged alphabetically by author or editor instead of by the title of Voltaire's work. All the correspondence has been grouped together, so that it will be necessary to refer to that section as well as to the headings in which one may be interested.

The abbreviations follow in general those of the earlier publications. However, for economy of space, serials or special publications appearing only once or twice in the text are given recognizable titles without abbreviations given in the list.¹

¹ The following abbreviations are employed.

Bull. Bibl.—Bulletin du bibliophile et du bibliothécaire.

Bull. S. H. Pr.—Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire du protestantisme français.

I. BIBLIOGRAPHY AND BIBLIOGRAPHICAL STUDIES

- Barr, M-M H Bibliographical data on Voltaire from 1926 to 1930.
MLN, 48 292-307, May 1933.
- Catalogue of fine illuminated manuscripts, valuable printed books
 April 26 London, Sotheby, 1937. 150 p Pp 4-12, collection of
 first and early editions of the works of Voltaire
- Catalogue of the famous library formed by the late Mortimer L
 Schiff London, Sotheby, 1938 3v 3 505-48, Voltaire collection
 (sold Dec 9, 1938)
- Crowley, Francis J Corrections and additions to Bengesco's *Bibliographie*
MLN, 50 440 41, Nov. 1935
- * Dacier, E Le "Voltaire de Kehl" de la Bibliothèque Nationale *Trésors des bibliothèques*, 5 208-13, 1935 (Harvard)
- Holbrook, Wm C A MS copy of writings by Voltaire *MLN*., 54
 365-66, May 1939 (An XVIIIth c. MS contains Sermon des
 cinquante, Épître à Uranie, Examen de la religion, Religion natu-
 relle. At Harvard)
- Johat, Eugène Smollett, editor of Voltaire *MLN*, 54 429-36, June 1939
- Meyer, E Variantes aux "poésies mêlées" de Voltaire d'après le manu-
 scrit envoyé par l'auteur à M de Cideville en 1735. *RHL*, 39.
 400-23, juil sept 1932
- Pike, Robert E Des notes sur Voltaire *RHL*, 42 214-17, avril-juin
 1935.
- Remak, Henry H A bibliographical note on Voltaire *MLN*, 54 520-22,
 Nov 1939 (Second ed. of Villette's works contains letters and
 epistles by Voltaire)
- Roberts, W Early editions of Voltaire *N&Q*., 171-58, July 25, 1936.
- Smith, Horatio Voltaire bibliographical notes *MLN*, 47 234-36,
 Apr 1932
- Les souvenirs de Mme de Caylus sont-ils de Voltaire? *Mercur*, 225
 503-05, 15 janv 1931.

Bull. S H Th—Bulletin de la Société des historiens du théâtre.

Intermédiaire—Intermédiaire des chercheurs et curieux.

Mercur—Le Mercur de France

MLN—Modern language notes.

MP—Modern philology.

N. Litt—Les nouvelles littéraires

N&Q—Notes and queries

PMLA—Publications of the Modern Language Association of America

RCC—Revue des cours et conférences

RHL—Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France.

RLC—Revue de littérature comparée

R. Paris—Revue de Paris.

RR—Romanic review

TLS—Times literary supplement

Z. Fr. Spr. L—Zeitschrift fur französische sprache und literatur.

- Vandérem, F *Encore Voltaire* *Bull. Bibl.*, 433-36, Oct 1938.
 Voltaire bibliography (La Pucelle). *Intermédiaire*, 161. 137, Aug. 22, 1931

II. GENERAL CRITICISM

- Auden, W H Great democrat [On Noyes and Torrey] *Nation*, 148: 352-53, March 25, 1939
- Brailsford, Henry N *Voltaire* New York, Henry Holt & Co; London, T. Butterworth (1935). 256 p. (Home university library of modern knowledge, no 151.)
- Charpentier, John *Voltaire* Paris, Tallandier (1938) 318 p. Review: Albert Schunz, *RR*, 30 307, Oct 1939
- Cohen-Portheim, Paul *The spirit of France*, trs by Alan Harris. London, Duckworth, 1933 215 p See pp 67-75. Review in *TLS.*, July 1933, p 457
- Condamin, Albert, S J Le "Grand homme" de M Albert Bayet. *Voltaire* Paris, Éd Spes, 1936 106 p.
- Crouvezier, G *Vie de Voltaire* Paris, F Sarlot (1938) 163 p
- Dubas, V. *Voltaire* Kaunas (Lithuania). *Lietuvos Universitetas Humanitarinių Mokslų fakultetas Humanitarinių Mokslų fakulteto rasta* Kaunas, 1932 t 10, pp 1-254
- Griggs, Edward H *Great leaders in human progress*. Indianapolis, Bobbs, Merrill, 1939 Pp. 160-73, *Voltaire*
- *Voltaire and the heritage of the eighteenth century; a handbook of six lectures* Croton-on-Hudson, Orchard Hill press (c. 1933). 44 p
- Guéhenno, Jean *Notes sur Voltaire*. *Nouvelle revue française*, 48: 524-37, 1 avril 1937
- *Notes sur Voltaire* In *Tableau de la littérature française, xviii, xviii siècles* Paris, Gallimard, [1939]. 490 p P 257-74
- Harper, Henry H *Voltaire*. (Boston) Bibliophile Society (1934?). 71 p
- Maurois, André. *Voltaire* New York, D Appleton, 148 p, 1932; Paris, Gallimard, 1935 140 p Review *TLS.*, Apr. 21, 1932, p 284.
- Noyes, Alfred *Voltaire* New York, Sheed and Ward, 1936 643 p Reviews Ernest Boyd, *Saturday R Lit*, 14 7, Sept 12, 1936; Albert Guéraud, Sr, *N. Y. Ht Books*, Oct 4, 1936, H Binns, *New Statesman*, 16 316, Apr 29, 1938,
- Gwynn, Denis "Voltaire" and the censors [Mr Noyes and the Holy Office]. *Dublin R*, 203: 179-211, Oct. 1938;
- Mercier, L J A *Voltaire* [censuring Mr Noyes's book]. *Commonweal*, 29 179-81, Dec 9, 1938,
- Ryan, Mary Alfred Noyes on Voltaire *Studies*, 26 281-96, June 1937
- See London *Times* Aug. 10-13, 15, 20, 25, 27, 30, 31, Sept. 5-7, 9, 10, 1938, for further discussion
- Réau, Louis *L'Europe française au siècle des lumières*. Paris, Albin Michel, 1938. 453 p. (Évolution de l'humanité, synthèse collective, 3. section.)

- Russell, Phillips The glittering century New York, Scribner, 1936 326 p See pp 82-103, 184-98, and scattered references
- Smith, Horatio Masters of French literature New York, Scribner (1937) 338 p. Pp. 109-62, Voltaire Review D. Mornet, *RHL*, 45 92-94, janv 1938
- Smith, Preserved A history of modern culture, v 2, 1687-1776 New York, Holt, 1934 703 p
- Torrey, Norman L The spirit of Voltaire New York, Columbia Univ. press, 1938 314 p Reviews Daniel Mornet, *RHL*, 45 532-33, oct-déc 1938, Edith Phillips, *RR*, 31 178-81, Apr. 1940, Ira Wade, *MLN*, 54 383-84, May 1939
- Williams, Charles W S Stories of great names London, Oxford Univ press, 1937 216 p See pp 141-64
- Winkler, Emil Voltaire *Deutsches Volkstum*, 18 742-48, Oct 1936

III. BIOGRAPHY

- Baldenspeiger, Fernand Un projet d'évasion des clercs, 1766. *R Paris*, 44 (2) 656-69, 1 avril 1937
- Voltaire et la diplomatie française dans les "affaires de Genève," 1765-70 *RLC*. 11 581-606, oct-déc 1931 Repr in his *Études d'histoire littéraire*, 4 série Paris, E Droz, 1939 Pp. 148-84.
- Voltaire et la Lorraine. *Pays lorrain*, 26 1-20, 209-28, 27 56-69, 403-17, janvier, mai 1934, février, sept 1935
- * Bernde, A Ferney *Garbe, schweizer familienblatt*, 11 565
- Chancellor, E Beresford Some bygone foreigners in London *XIXth century*, 116 297-307, Sept. 1934. See pp 298-99.
- Chaponnière, Paul Voltaire chez les calvinistes. Genève, Éditions du *Journal de Genève*, 1932 182 p quarto Also, Paris, Perrin, 1936 267 p in-12 Reviews Daniel Mornet, *RHL*, 43 305, avril-juin 1936, Raoul Patry, *Bull S. H. Pr*, 81 440-42, 1932; A. Schinz, *Books abroad*, 7 5-8, 1933
- Chapuisat, Édouard A propos de Voltaire et de Marie-Françoise Corneille *Temps*, 9 février 1938, p 3
- Chauvin, A. La translation du corps de Voltaire *Intermédiaire*, col. 765-66, 1934
- Cœur de Voltaire *Intermédiaire*, 98 91, 15 fév 1935
- Coutet, Alexandre Jean Calas roué vif et innocent [Anduze], Publication du Musée du désert, 1933 330 p Review by Raoul Patry, *Bull S H Pr*, 83 714-18, 1934
- Dechent, H Voltaire im urteil der Frankfurter zeitgenossen. *Volk und scholle Heimatblatt für beide Hessen*, 11 86-89, 1933
- Dedieu, Joseph. Un incident inédit de la vie de Voltaire. *RHL*, 42 218-22, 1935
- Delage, J Les grands hommes de France en Alsace. *Annuaire de la Société littéraire et scientifique du club vosgeois* n s. 1 60-73, 1933 (Harvard).

- Dumas, Gustave Voltaire's Jesuit chaplain (Père Adam) *Thought* (Fordham U), 15 17-26, Mar 1940.
- Fabre, Marcel Voltaire et Pimpette de Nîmes *Mém. Acad. Nîmes*, 7 s 50, xli-lxix, 1935
- Foister, Edward M Abinger harvest New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1936. 363 p. Voltaire's laboratory, pp 204-18 See *Life and letters*. Summer 1931, pp 157-73
- Happy ending [Ferney] *New Statesman*, 20 442, Nov 2, 1940.
- Graud, Victor Voltaire et Madame du Deffand *Revue politique et littéraire*, 71 583-89, 7 oct 1933
- Les derniers jours et la mort de Voltaire, lettres inédites de La Harpe à Boissy d'Anglas *RHL*, 45. 360-63, juil-sept 1938
- Hazewinkel, J G. De Koning van den Rococotijd (Frederick II and Voltaire). *Historia* (Utrecht), 5 166-68, Juli 1939
- Humbourg, Pierre Ferney Lambert *N Litt*, 28 juil 1934, p 4
- Jacobet, Henri Variétés d'histoire littéraire, de méthodologie et de critique littéraire Paris, Soc d'éd "Les Belles lettres," 1935. 291 p Voltaire et le mystère de l'innocence de Calas, pp 167-206.
- Krammer, Mario Friedrich der Grosse und Voltaire In. Kern, Hans, ed. Schoefenische freundschaft. Jena, Eugen Diedrich (1932) 205 p Pp 7-44
- Labastie, docteur Les dessous de l'histoire 4 révélation La vie amoureuse de M de Voltaire. Paris, Éd Imprimor (1933). 48 p.
- Laughlin, R A Famous premature babies *Hygeia*, 17 203-06, Mar. 1939
- Levin, Lawrence M A note on the Arouet > Voltaine problem *Studies in philology*, 34. 52-54, Jan 1937
- Lewis, Frank R An Englishman visits Voltaire. (Sir Thomas Pennant, "Tour on the Continent" MS in the Welsh National Library, visit to Ferney in 1765) *TLS.*, Aug 20, 1938, p. 543.
- Moorman, Lewis J Tuberculosis and genius Voltaire *Annals of medical history* n s 3 626-37, Dec 1931.
- Tuberculosis and genius Chicago, Univ of Chicago press (1940) 271 p Pp 124-46, a revised version of the above article.
- Oulmont, Charles Au château de Cirey avec Voltaire *Temps*, 28 sept 1934
- . Demeures françaises. Ferney-Voltaire (documents inédits) *Temps*, 15 sept. 1935
- . Quand Voltaire allait aux eaux (Plombières). *Temps*, 9 nov 1934
- . Voltaire en robe de chambre Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 1936 224 p. (Nouvelle collection historique)
- Paulding, Gouverneur. Visit to Voltaine *Commonweal*, 22 66-68, May 17, 1935.
- Petit, Georges Voltaire et la petite histoire *Chronique médicale*, 43: 221-25, sept 1936 (Le physique de Voltaire)
- Pignet, Gilbert. M de Voltaire et la vérité sur sa vie amoureuse. Paris, Fasquelle (1938) 207 p

- Racz, Louis, éd Correspondance d'un pasteur français et d'un comte hongrois au XVIII^e siècle (Comte Teleki, J. Duvoisin, Mme Duvoisin, née Calas, 1763-1780) *Bull S H Pr*, 80 349-81, 1931
- Sayous, André E Genève au temps de Rousseau et de Voltaire *Institut de France Académie des sciences morales et politiques Séances et travaux Compte-rendu* 1935 nov-déc Pp 372-92
- Spink, John S Mlle Clairon à Ferney, quelques documents inédits *Bull. S H Théâtre*, pp 65-74, juil 1935
- Stern, Jean Belle et Bonne, une fervente amie de Voltaire (1757-1822) (Paris) Hachette (1938) 254 p
- Strachey, Giles Lytton Characters and commentaries London, Chatto, 1933 Voltaire, pp. 239-45
- . President de Brosses *New Republic*, 66 267-70, 22 Apr 1931, *New Statesman and nation*, 1 250-51, 281-82, 11, 18 Apr 1931
- . Voltaire et l'Angleterre *R hebdomadaire*, 44 (3) 562-88, 30 mars 1935 Extr *Books and characters*
- . Voltaire og Frederik den Store (Illus) *Tilskueren*, 48 113-34, Feb 1931 Danish text
- 200 years ago (Voltaire's imprisonment and his sojourn in Paris). *N&Q.*, 162 289, 307, Apr 23, 30, 1932
- Voltaire intime (à Ferney) *N Litt*, 21 avril 1934, p. 6

IV. VOLTAIRE THE WRITER AND THINKER

- Amato, Jole La grammaire et le lexique de Voltaire Palermo, Trimarchi, 1938 78 p.
- Bachman, Albert Censorship in France from 1715 to 1750,—Voltaire's opposition. New York, Institute of French Studies, 1934 206 p
Reviews H L Brugmans, *RR*, 27 42, 1936, Daniel Mornet, *RHL*, 43 130, janv-mars 1936, Albert Schinz, *RHL*, 42 450-53, juil-sept 1935.
- Baldensperger, F Intellectuels français hors de France II De Voltaire à Chateaubriand *RCC*, 36 (1) 41-52, 227-38, 289-98; 36 (2) 353-62, 15 déc. 1934, 15, 30 janv, 30 mai 1935
- . Voltaire et les affaires sud-américaines *RLC*, 11 76-77, janv 1931.
- Barras, Moses Stage controversy in France from Corneille to Rousseau New York, Institute of French studies (1933). 358 p See Ch 10, pp. 186-210
- Bessmertny, Bertha. Voltaire historien des sciences *Archeton, Archivio di storia della scienza*, 17 171-75, 1935 (Discussion, pp 258-59)
- Borgerhoff, E. B O Evolution of liberal thought and practice in the French theatre, 1680-1757. Princeton, Princeton Univ. press, 1936 117 p.
- * Burte, H Gedichte Voltaires in das deutsche ubertragen Munchen, Oldenbourg, 1934. 72 p. (Schriften der Corona x.)
- Courtines, Pierre. Voltaire, novateur dramatique *Messenger de New York*, 14 16-20, 15 août 1937.

- Dagen, Georges La médecine et les médecins dans les romans de Voltaire (Extr des *Nouvelles thérapeutiques*) *Echo médical du Nord*, 37 587-88, 9 dec 1933.
- Faguet, Emile Histoire de la poésie française de la Renaissance au romantisme, t VII, Voltaire Paris, Boivin (1934) 264 p Review. Emile Henriot, Voltaire poète. *Temps*, 6 nov 1934
- Fuller, J F C Voltaire's tank. *Spectator*, 165. 336, Oct. 4, 1940.
- * Giddings, N C The chorus in French tragedy from Jodelle to Voltaire Diss Harvard, 1938.
- Giannis, Valleria B Dramatic parody in eighteenth-century France. New York, Institute of French studies (1931) 429 p Pp 245-349, Parodies on Voltaire
- Guiet, René Tragédie française au XVIII^e siècle et le théâtre de Métastase *PMLA*, 53 813-26, Sept. 1938
- Kohn-Bramstedt, E France and French enlightenment in the XVIIIth century. In Mayer, Jacob P and others Political thought: the European tradition New York, Viking press, 1939. 485 p. Pp 205-30
- Knobloch, Hans Witzgegenstände und witzformen in der erzählenden prosa Voltaires Wurzburg, K Triltsch, 1937 59 p Inaug-diss.
- Lowenstein, Robert Voltaire as an historian of seventeenth-century French drama Baltimore, Johns Hopkins press, 1935. 195 p (Johns Hopkins studies in Romance literature and languages, v. 25) Reviews R Naves, *RHL*, 43 443-45, juil 1936, N L. Torrey, *MLN*, 51 477-78, Nov 1936.
- McGhee, Dorothy M. Voltairian narrative devices as considered in the author's Contes philosophiques Menasha, Wis, Banta pub co., 1931 192 p Review Raymond Naves, *RHL*, 41 614-15, oct-déc. 1934
- Naves, Raymond Le goût de Voltaire Paris, Garnier, 1938. 567 p. Review George R Havens, *RR*, 31, 77-78, 1940
- Trahard, Pierre Les maîtres de la sensibilité française au XVIII^e siècle (1715-1789) Paris, Boivin, 1931-32 3v 1 237-59, La sensibilité dans le théâtre de Voltaire (1718-1743) Review G R. Havens, *MLN*, 49 268-69, Apr 1933
- Wade, Ira O A favorite metaphor of Voltaire *RR*, 26 330-34, Oct 1935.
- Wood, Kathryn L. The French theatre in the eighteenth century according to some contemporary English travellers *RLC*, 12: 601-18, juil-sept 1932.

A. Voltaire the Philosopher

- Becker, Carl L The heavenly city of the eighteenth-century philosophers New Haven, Yale Univ press, 1932 168 p
- Bonno, Gabriel La constitution britannique devant l'opinion française de Montesquieu à Bonaparte Paris, Champion, 1931 319 p Thèse, Paris See pp. 110-18

- Bontoux, G. *Voltaire contre les sans-Dieu* Paris, Éditions Éducation intégrale (1935) 92 p (Pour les humbles)
- Carré, J-R. *La consistance de Voltaire le philosophe* Paris, Boivin, 1938 106 p (Repr from *RCC*, 39 (2) 97-108, 193-211, 289-307, 531-52, 602-25, 30 avril, 15, 30 mai, 15 juil 1938)
- *Pascal et Voltaire Raison ou sentiment R métaphysique et morale*, 42 358-73, juil 1935 Ch 3 of *Réflexions sur l'Anti-Pascal*
- Chatterjee, Asutosh. *Voltaireanism Calcutta R*, 3, 5, 72, 161-71, Aug 1939.
- Chazel, Pierre. *Allocution pour le 150e anniversaire de l'édit de tolérance de 1787 Bull. S. H. Pr*, 86 258-64, 1937
- Citoleux, Marc. *L'esprit français et l'esprit de Voltaire Mercure*, 247 96-107, 1 oct 1933
- Craveri, Raimondo. *Voltaire politico dell'illuminismo* Torino, G. Einaudi, 1937 183 p
- Crist, C M. *Voltaire, Barcochébas and the early French deists. French R*, 6 483-89, May 1933.
- Cuneo, Niccolò. *La sociologia di Voltaire* Genova, Emiliano degli Orfini (1938), 100 p (Collana della nuova cultura diretta da Arturo Farinelli, 15)
- Dez, Gaston. *Pourquoi et comment un édit de tolérance a été accordé en 1787 Bull. S. H. Pr*, 86 506-13, 1937
- Ellwood, Charles A. *Story of social philosophy* New York, Prentice-Hall, 1938 581 p. French revolutionary thinkers, pp 184-215; Voltaire, pp. 185-98
- Engemann, Walter. *Voltaire und China. ein beitrage zur geschichte der volkerkunde und zur geschichte der geschichtsschreibung sowie zu ihren gegenseitigen beziehungen* (Leipzig), 1932. 155 p.
- Fischer, Eberhard. *Voltaire als paedagoge* Leipzig, Druckerei der Wer gemeinschaft, 1934 106 p Inaug.-diss. Leipzig.
- Fitch, Robert E. *Voltaire's philosophic procedure; a case-study in the history of ideas* Forest Grove, Oregon, News-times publ co, 1935 99 p Columbia diss
- Golding, Claud. *Great names in history*, 356 B C.-A. D 1910 Philadelphia, Lippincott, 1935 300 p. Pp 179-84, Voltaire precursor of the French revolution
- Gotzfried, Hans Leo. *Versuch einer neuen deutung des charakters von Voltaire auf grund moderner psychologischer forschungen. Z. F. Spr. L*, 57 211-20, 1933.
- Goubard, Marguerite. *Voltaire et l'impôt Les idées fiscales de Voltaire* Paris, Presses modernes, 1931 183 p Thèse, Paris, Droit
- Hastings, Hester. *Man and beast in French thought of the eighteenth century* Baltimore, Johns Hopkins press, 1936 297 p (Johns Hopkins studies in Romance languages and literature, v 27.) See especially pp. 138-44, 182-84
- Hazard, Paul. *Voltaire et Leibnitz Académie royale de Belgique. Classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques* 5. série, 23 435-49, 1937.

- Hazard, Paul Voltaire et la pensée philosophique de la Renaissance italienne
In *Mélanges offerts à M Abel Lefranc*. Paris, E Droz, 1936. 506
p Pp 473-78
- Honigsheim, Paul Voltaire und die probleme der volkerannaherung
(1939) 16 p Sonderabdruck aus heft 4 des 39 jahrgangs (1939)
der Zeitschrift "Die friedenswarte"
- Kaegi, Werner Voltaire und der zerfall des christlichen geschichtsbildes.
Corona, 8 76-101, 1938
- Kellenberger, Hunter Voltaire's treatment of the miracle of Christ's
temptation in the wilderness *MLN*, 51 17-21, Jan 1936.
- LeFlamanc, A Les Utopies prérévolutionnaires et la philosophie du XVIII^e
siècle Paris, Vrin, 1934. 178 p
- Libby, Margaret The attitude of Voltaire to magic and the sciences
New York, Columbia univ press, 1935 229 p
- Lovejoy, A O The parallel of deism and classicism *MP*, 29 281-99,
Feb 1932
- Madelin, Louis Le crépuscule de la monarchie "C'est la faute à Vol-
taire" *R Hebdomadaire*, 45(2) 282-312, 8 févr. 1936
- Mathiez, Albert Les nouveaux courants d'idées dans la littérature
française à la fin du XVIII^e siècle *Annales historiques de la Révo-
lution française* 12 193-204, mai 1935
- , Les philosophes et le pouvoir au milieu du XVIII^e siècle *Annales
historiques de la Révolution française*, 12 1-12, janv 1935.
- Morais, Herbert Deism in eighteenth-century America. New York,
Columbia univ press, 1934 205 p
- Mornet, D Origines intellectuelles de la Révolution française (1715-1787).
Paris, Colin, 1933. 552 p Voltaire, pp 28-32, 82-89, 97-100,
passim See *Annales Univ Paris*, 8 307-19, juil août 1933.
- Niven, W D Great attacks on Christianity 3 Voltaire *Expository
times*, 43 109-14, Dec 1931
- Padover, S K The first liberal *American Mercury*, 37 221-28, Feb.
1936
- Philips, Edith The good Quaker in French legend Philadelphia, Univ.
of Pennsylvania press, 1932 235 p The Quakers seen by Voltaire,
pp. 43-67. Review Louis Cons, *RLC*, 14 591-93, juil-sept. 1934;
TLS., Apr 6, 1933, p 239
- Le Quaker vu par Voltaire *RHL*, 39. 161-77, avril, juin 1932.
- Price, E H The opinions of Voltaire concerning Montesquieu's theories
of Roman greatness *Philological Q*, 16 287-95, July 1937
- Rosenfield, Leonora C From beast-machine to man-machine The theme
of animal soul in French letters from Descartes to LaMettrie.
Preface by Paul Hazard New York, Oxford Univ press, 1940 353
p Columbia dissertation. See pp 128-32, 163-64
- Saintville, G Sur une comparaison de Vauvenagues et Pascal par Vol-
taire. *RHL*, 38 592-98, oct déc 1931
- Seeber, Edward D Anti-slavery opinion in France during the second half
of the eighteenth century Baltimore, Johns Hopkins press, 1937,

- 238 p. (Johns Hopkins studies in Romance literatures and languages, extra vol 10.) Review M. Cook, *RR*, 29. 291-31, Oct 1938
- * Stakemann, Johann Georg Voltaire, wegbereiter der französischen revolution. Berlin-Schöneberg, Verlag Deutsche Kulturwacht, 1936 278 p. Yale
- Torrey, N L Voltaire's reaction to Diderot *PMLA*, 50 1107-43, Dec. 1935
- Zouckermann, Raymond. Voltaire physicien *N Litt*, 9 sept 1933, p. 8

B. Literary Relationships, Influences and Opinions.

- Allen, Mozelle S. Poe's debt to Voltaire *Studies in English* (U. Texas Bull) no 15, pp 63-75
- Aronson, Alexander. Lessing et les classiques français. Contribution à l'étude des rapports littéraires entre la France et l'Allemagne au XVIII^e siècle Montpellier, Impr de la Charité, 1935 279 p. Thèse d'Université, Toulouse See pp 94-118, 231-35
- Barnes, Bertram. Goethe's knowledge of French literature. Oxford, Univ. press, 1937 (Oxford Studies in modern languages and literatures.) See pp 45-50 and other references
- * Beckmann, B., Pollert, H Voltaire und Shakespeare *Unser Egerland*, 35 J. 119.
- Bertaux, Pierre Goethe et Voltaire. In *Mélanges Lichtenberger*. Paris, Stock, 1934 447 p Pp 29-32, comparison of their texts on nature.
- * Bourget, P. Voltaire et Goethe *Figaro*, 14 nov. 1931.
- Breuer, Johannes Claude François Nonnotte, S J ; seine bedeutung als philosophischer gegner der aufklärung im besondern Voltaire's. Werl, Fortschritt-druckerei, 1933 75 p Inaug.-diss. Bonn
- Brian-Chaninov, Nicolas. Voltaire et quelques Russes de son temps *Mercure*, 257. 628-33, 1. fevrier 1935
- Brummer, Rudolf Studien zur französischen aufklärungsliteratur im anschluss an J A. Nageon Breslau, 1932 338 p. (Sprache und kultur der Germanisch-Romanischen volker, 11) Voltaire, pp 126-30, 176-81, 240-43, etc.
- * Brunelli, B Il giudizio di Voltaire intorno ad una tragedia italiana [il Cresfonte di G. Liviera (1588)]. *Rivista italiana del dramma*, 2. 252-56 (Johns Hopkins)
- Cazes, André Grimm et les Encyclopédistes Paris, Presses universitaires 1933. 408 p. Thèse, Paris. See pp. 76-79, 92-96, 181-85, 198-205, etc.
- Chinard, Gilbert. Notes de John Adams sur Voltaire et Rousseau *MLN.*, 46. 26-31, Jan. 1931
- Choisy, Albert. Libelles de Voltaire contre Rousseau, 1765. *Annales Soc. JJR*, 25. 251-66, 1936
- Cioranescu, Al. L'Arioste en France des origines à la fin du XVIII^e siècle. Paris, Presses modernes, 1939. 2 v. (Publications de l'École roumaine en France. Série historique II, III.) 2 109-41.

- Clark, Harry H. Thomas Paine's relation to Voltaire and Rousseau. *R. Anglo-Américaine*, 9 305-18, 393-405, avril, juin 1932.
- Claude-Marie Graud (au service de Voltaire comme copiste d'une Épître du diable à M de Voltaire). *Chronique médicale*, 42 255-58, 315, sept, déc 1935
- Crist, C M Some judgments of Voltaire by contemporaries *MLN*, 50 439-40, Nov. 1935
- DeMartino, Carlo Monsieur de Voltaire nella letteratura bergamasca. *Rivista di Bergamo*, 10 496-502, Nov. 1931.
- Derzhavin, K Voltaire traité comme lecteur de "Émile" de Rousseau. *Bull de l'Académie des sciences de l'URSS Classe des humanités* (sciences sociales), 7 série, pp 317-39, 1932 (Russian text)
- Devalle, Albertina. La critica letteraria nel 700. G. Baretta, i suoi rapporti con Voltaire, Johnson e Parini Con prefazione di Vittorio Cian Milano, Hoepli, 1932 198 p See pp 15-67
- * Duffo, abbé F L'abbé Guénée, agrégé de l'Université, adversaire de Voltaire (1717-1803). Paris, P. Lethielleux, 1933 106 p
- Feugère, A. La "Lettre à d'Alembert", la querelle de Rousseau et de Voltaire *RCC*, 36 (1) 114-31, 30 déc. 1934.
- Gardner, Juliet Chesterfield and Voltaire *Cornhill*, 155 107-19, Jan. 1937.
- Gautier, René Deux aspects du style classique Bossuet et Voltaire. La Rochelle, Librairie Pyollet, 1936 43 p (Institut d'études françaises de La Rochelle)
- Glaesener, Henri Goethe imitateur et traducteur de Voltaire au théâtre. *RLC*, 13 217-31, avril-juin 1933
- Green, F C Minuet a critical survey of French and English literary ideas in the eighteenth century London, J. M. Dent (1935). 489 p Ch 3 Shakespeare and Voltaire, pp 54-83, also, pp 130-35, 198-204, 467-70, and many short references.
- Grosclaude, Pierre La vie intellectuelle à Lyon dans la deuxième moitié du XVIII^e siècle Contribution à l'histoire littéraire de province Paris, A. Picard, 1933 464 p Thèse, Paris. Voltaire et Lyon, pp 263-305.
- Halász, Zsuzsanna Voltaire a XIX század itéletében. Budapest, Bethlen, 1934 135 p (Reactions of XIXth c. French authors)
- Haraszti, Zoltán. John Adams on Frederick the Great. His marginal notes on the King's poems and correspondence with Voltaire and D'Alembert now first published. *More books*, 9 117-33, 161-73, Apr, May 1934.
- Havens, Geo R A corrected reading of one of Voltaire's notes on Rousseau's *Émile* *MLN*, 47 20, Jan 1932
- Voltaire's marginal comments on Rousseau. *South Atlantic Q.*, 31. 408-16, Oct 1932.
- Voltaire's marginalia on the pages of Rousseau a comparative study of ideas Columbus, Ohio, The Ohio state university, 1933 199 p (Ohio state university studies. Graduate school series

- Contributions in languages and literatures, no 6) Review Daniel Moynet, *RHL*, 41 135-36, janv 1934
- Havens, Geo R Voltaire's note on *Émile* once more *MLN*, 47 325, May 1932.
- Les notes marginales de Voltaire sur Rousseau *RHL*, 40 434-40, juil-sept 1933. Trs from *South Atlantic Q*
- Haxo, Henry E Pierre Bayle et Voltaire avant les *Lettres philosophiques*. *PMLA*, 46 461-97, June 1931
- Hervier, Marcel. Les écrivains français jugés par leurs contemporains II Le XVIII^e siècle Paris, Mellottée (1936?). 274 p See pp. 37-139
- Hessling, D C P. de Wakker van Zon en Voltaire In *Mélanges offerts à J J Salverda de Grave* La Haye, Soc. anonyme d'édition, 1934 424 p Pp 165-74
- Jagdhuhn, Gertrud Die dichtungen Friedrichs des Grossen *Romanische forschungen*, 50 137-240, 1936
- Jaloux, Edmond Perspectives et personnages l'esprit des livres, 3 série Paris, Plon, 1931 252 p Voltaire et M Jacques Bainville, pp 15-24
- Jan, Eduard von Voltaire und die gegenwart *German-Roman monatschrift*, 19 285-303, Juli 1931
- Jeanné, Égide. L'image de la Pucelle d'Orléans dans la littérature française depuis Voltaire Paris, J Vrin, 1935 232 p Diss See pp 8-24.
- Josefson, Ruben. Andreas Knos om Voltaire och encyklopedisterna. In: Till Gustaf Aulén 19 15/5 39 Stockholm, 1930 413 p Pp. 166-74.
- Keyser, Sijbrand Contribution à l'étude de la fortune littéraire de l'Arioste en France Leyden, M. Dubbeldeman, 1933. 227 p Pp. 129-78, l'Arioste et Voltaire
- Knauer, Karl. Voltaire- und Rousseau stil Versuch einer interpretation gehaltbeladener prosa-rhythmen *German-Roman monatschrift*, 24. 382-99, juli. 1936
- LaHarpe, Jacqueline de La "Muse et Grâce" de Voltaire, le conte de fée en France vers 1750 *PMLA*, 54 454-66, June 1939. (Marie-Madeleine de Lubert)
- Langer, Werner Friedrich der Grosse und die geistige welt Frankreichs. *Hamburger Studien zu volkstum und kultur der Romanen*. Band 11. Hamburg, 1932 195 p (Formerly *Seminar f romanische sprachen und kultur*)
- Lyubinski, V The heritage of Voltaire in Russia (Russian text). In *Literaturnoe Nasledstvo Russkaya kultura i Francija*. Moscow, 1937. no 29-30
- Maillet, Albert Dryden et Voltaire *RLC*, 18 272-86, avril-juin 1938
- Marion, Séraphin Le problème voltairien *Canadian Catholic historical association. Report 1939/40*, French section, pp. 27-41
- . Le voltairianisme de la Gazette littéraire de Montréal. *R. Université d'Ottawa*, 9. 393-408, 10 7-28, 1939, 1940.
- McDermott, J. F. Voltaire and the free-thinkers in early St Louis. *RLC.*, 6 720-31, oct-déc. 1936.

- Michaux, F. A travers les œuvres de Victor Hugo notice sur Voltaire. *Bull Bibl* n. s., 16 402-05, août 1937
- Mohrenschildt, Dimitri S von Russia in the intellectual life of eighteenth-century France New York, Columbia Univ press, 1936. 325 p Reviews G Lozinski, *RLC*, 18 392-400, avril-juin 1938, N L Torrey, *RR*, 28 289, Oct 1937
- Mongrédien, Georges Jean-Jacques annoté par Voltaire *N. Litt.*, 17 mars 1934 P. 2
- Morehouse, Andrew R Voltaire and Jean Meslier New Haven, Conn., Yale Univ press, 1936 158 p Reviews Daniel Mornet, *RHL*, 43 594-95, 1936, Ira Wade, *RR*, 28 285-89, Oct 1937
- Mowat, Robert B The age of reason The continent of Europe in the eighteenth century Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1934. 336 p. Goethe and Voltaire The war against prejudice, pp 35-49, other references throughout
- Naves, R Voltaire éditeur de Rousseau (Profession de foi d'un vicaire savoyard). *RHL*, 44 245-47, avril-juin 1937
- Voltaire et l'Encyclopédie Paris, Presses modernes, 1938 206 p Reviews Ira Wade, *RR*, 31 78-81, 1940, G R Havens, *MLN*, 54 617, Dec, 1939
- Nolhac, Pierre de Voltaire juge de Louis XV *N Litt*, 27 mai 1933 P 1.
- Ortiz Arigós de Montoya, Delia Pascal y Voltaire contra Descartes In. La Plata Universidad nacional Escritos en honor de Descartes, 1938 Pp. 145-64
- Pommier, Jean Le cycle de Chactas *RLC*, 18: 604-29, oct-déc. 1938 (Influence of Voltaire's Works on Chateaubriand)
- Ralph, Dorothy M Jean de Meun, the Voltaire of the middle ages. Urbana, Ill, 1940 6 p Abstract of thesis (Ph D), U. of Illinois.
- Rockwood, Raymond O The cult of Voltaire to 1791, a revolutionary deity, 1789-May 30, 1791 (Chicago), 1937 Pp 137-78. Part of Ph D thesis, U of Chicago, Dept. of history, 1935 Lithoprinted
- Voltaire *J mod hist*, 9 493-501, Dec 1937. (Review of books by Brailsford, Libby, Morehouse, Noyes, Oulmont)
- Rowbotham, Arnold H China and the age of enlightenment in Europe. *Chinese social and political science R*, 19 176-201, July 1935
- The "Philosophes" and the propaganda for inoculation of small-pox in eighteenth-century France U Cal publ in modern philology, 18, Berkeley, U California press, 1936 500 p Pp. 265-90.
- . Voltaire sinophile *PMLA.*, 47 1050-65, Dec 1932
- * Scheer, P van der Het satanisme in de Fransche litteratur, iv, v. *Studien*, 116 319-45, 118 354-72
- Schinz, Albert, éd Documents nouveaux sur Rousseau et Voltaire. (Les "Boswell papers") *R. Paris*, 40 (3) 299-325, 630-67, 15 mai, 1. juin 1933.
- Rousseau, les déistes et les pasteurs *RR.*, 28 46-53, Feb 1937.

- Schmidt, Justus Voltaire und Maria Theresia, französische kultur des barock in ihren beziehungen zu Österreich *Mitteilungen des Vereines fur geschichte der stadt Wien*, 11 73-115, 1931
- Tronchon, Henri Les œuvres posthumes de Jean Fekete de Galántha, voltairien de Hongrie *R études hongroises*, 12 69-99, janv-juin 1934
- Voltaire nella letteratura bergamasca *Marzocco*, anno 36, no 46, p 3, 15 nov 1931
- Voltaire's library *Sat R Lit*, 10 111, Sept 16, 1933
- Wade, Ira O The clandestine organization and diffusion of philosophic ideas in France from 1700 to 1750 Princeton, N. J, Univ press, 1938 329 p Pp 65-93, Works of Jean Meslier, and other references Reviews E Malakis, *MLN*, 54 385-86, May 1939, N. L Torrey, *RR*, 30 205-09, Apr 1939
- Poems attributed to Voltaire *MP*, 34 63-73, Aug 1936
- Voltaire and Baillet's Manual of pseudonyms *MLN*, 50: 209-15, Apr '35
- Voltaire and Malesherbes *French R*, 8 357-69, 455-80, Apr, May 1935
- and Torrey, N L Voltaire and Polher de Bottens *RR*, 31 147-55, Apr '40
- Whitman, Walt Voltaire (written for *Life illustrated*, May 10, 1856). In his New York dissected New York, Rufus R Wilson, 1936. Pp. 70-73
- Wogue, J., éd Voltaire vu par un de ses interprètes (Boutet de Monvel) *N. Litt*, 30 oct 1937, p 10
- Ziino, Michele Voltaire, Rousseau e i *Promessi sposi* *Giornale storico*, 101 350-54, giugno 1933

V. CORRESPONDENCE

- Avezou, Robert Lettres de Voltaire conservées aux Archives de la Haute-Savoie *Académie florimontane d'Annecy. Revue savoisienne*, 1934. Année 75, pp 182-87
- Baldensperger, F., éd. Lettres inédites ou négligées de Voltaire *RLC*, 11 268-73, avril 1931
- Catherine II Documents of Catherine the Great. The correspondence with Voltaire and the Instruction of 1767 in the English text of 1768, ed by Wm F Reddaway. Cambridge, Univ press, 1931 349 p
- Charlier, Gustave. De Ronsard à Victor Hugo. Problèmes d'histoire littéraire Bruxelles, Éd. Revue universelle de Bruxelles, 1931 335 p Voltaire à Francfort d'après des lettres inédites, pp. 169-80
- Crowley, Francis J., ed New Voltaire-Gabriel Cramer letters. *RR*, 30. 39-51, 133-50, Feb., Apr., 1939.
- Some neglected letters of Voltaire *MLN*, 50: 215-16, Apr. 1935.
- Two unpublished letters of Voltaire (to Francis Hastings, tenth earl of Huntingdon). *MLN*, 49: 181, Mar. 1934.

- Dapp, Kathryn G George Keate, Esq, eighteenth-century English gentleman Philadelphia, 1939 184 p. Pp 93-103, Voltaire's "très cher confrère," pp 176-82, 26 letters from Voltaire to George Keate
- Feugère, A Un compte fantastique de Voltaire· 95 lettres anonymes attribuées à La Beaumelle In *Mélanges* . Paul Laumonier Paris, E Droz, 1935 682 p See pp 435-51.
- Fucilla, Joseph G, ed Unedited Voltaire letters to Count di Polcemigo *MLN*, 54 184-88, Mar. 1939
- Havens, G R, ed Twelve new letters of Voltaire to Gabriel Cramer *RR*, 31 341-54, Dec 1940
- Hawkins, Richmond L, ed Newly discovered French letters of the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries Cambridge, Mass, Harvard University press, 1933. 288 p. Voltaire letters, pp 29-39, see also pp 56-60, 87-90.
- Hemerding, Gabriel. Voltaire et son chariot de guerre, 1756-57, 1769-70, d'après sa correspondance *Revue d'artillerie*, 57 587-607, 1934
- Holbrook, W C Voltaire et Blin de Sainmore; an unpublished Voltaire letter *MLN*, 49 470-72, Nov 1934
- Meyer, E Addition à la correspondance échangée entre Voltaire et l'évêque d'Annecy à propos de ses communions de 1768 et 1769. *RHL*, 43 573-84, oct-déc 1936
- Billets inédits de Voltaire *Grande R.*, 135. 446 52, mai 1931
- Ricci, Seymour de, éd Lettres de Voltaire sur Corneille et Racine. Voltaire et Blin de Sainmore *R. deux mondes* 8 pér. 38 366-88, 15 mars 1937.
- Rivière, M Voltaire et Blin de Sainmore (au sujet d'une collection de 21 lettres autographes de V. à B de S). *Intermédiaire*, 98· 624, 1935. See also· col 786, 886-87
- Roosbroeck, G van, ed An unpublished letter of Mme de Pompadour to Voltaire (1745) *Neophilologus*, 20 90-91, 1935.
- * ———. An unpublished letter of Voltaire about the acquisition of "Les Délices" *Neuphilologische mitteilungen*, 36 290-93, 1935. Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Yale
- Sacke, Georg Entstehung des briefwechsels zwischen der Kaiserin Katharina II von Russland und Voltaire *ZSFr Spr L.*, 61 273-82, 1937.
- Seitz, Robert W Voltaire: une lettre à Sir Wilham Chambers. *Intermédiaire*, 100. 238, 30 mars 1937.
- Shazmann, P. E Voltaire et ses voisins de Feuillasse, d'après des documents inédits. (2 lettres de Voltaire sur un projet de vente de ce château) *Gazette de Lausanne*, 27 janv 1935
- Vaganay, L J Autographes de Voltaire à la bibliothèque de Tartu *RHL*, 44 84-85, janv-mars 1937.
- Valkhoff, P. Lettres inédites de Voltaire à Constant d'Hermanches. In *Mélanges* . . Salverda de Grave, pp. 347-57
- Voltaire Billets inédits (adressés au colonel Frey à Bâle, un s. d, l'autre du 20 févr 1767) *J. Genève*, 29 oct. 1933
- Voltaire et Blin de Sainmore *Intermédiaire*, 98· 624, 786, 886, 100· 682.

Voltaire. Lettres d'Alsace à sa nièce Madame Denis, publiées d'après les manuscrits originaux, avec des introductions et des notes par G Jean-Aubry Paris, Gallimard (1938) 284 p Review Daniel Mornet *RHL*, 46 252, juil 1939

Wade, Ira O Some forgotten letters of Voltaire *MLN*, 47 211-25, Apr 1932

VI. CRITICISM OF SEPARATE WORKS

(Arranged alphabetically according to authors)

Ascoli, Georges Voltaire Poèmes philosophiques (Le Mondain, Discours sur l'homme, Désastie de Lisbonne) Paris, Centre de documentation universitaire (1934) 207 p in 5 parts mimeographed (Cours de Sorbonne Licence ès lettres, certificat d'études supérieures)

Baldensperger, Fernand Le madrigal de Voltaire à la princesse Ulrique *R Paris*, 38 (3) 754-73, 15 juin 1931

—— Réponse [à M Jean David] *MLN*, 53 318, Apr 1938

—— Voltaire contre la Suisse de Jean-Jacques la tragédie des *Scythes* *RCC*, 32 (2) 673-89, 30 juil 1931

Baldini, Massimo La genesi del *Saul* di Vittorio Alfieri Firenze, LeMonnier, 1934 223 p See pp 113-27

* Becker, A Unbekannte gedicht Voltaires aus die Pfalz *Pfalz Museum*, 48 J 252, 1931

* Bellessort, André Le Dictionnaire philosophique *Débats*, 9 avril 1931

Benda, Julien and Naves, Raymond, éd Le Dictionnaire philosophique, édition critique Paris, Garnier (1936). 2 v. Review: Daniel Mornet, *RHL*, 43 596-97, oct-déc 1936

—— En marge d'un dictionnaire [Le Dictionnaire philosophique] *R Paris*, 43 (2) 18-29, 1 mars 1936

Bergner, Georges Lettres philosophiques de Voltaire. *Alsace française*, 14 381, 1934

Bird, C W Voltaire, a source for Hugo's *Sultan Mourad* *MLN*, 47 237, 1832 (A passage in *L'Essai sur les mœurs*)

Bonno, Gabriel Un texte inédit de l'abbé Leblanc sur les *Lettres philosophiques* de Voltaire *MLN*, 55. 503-05, Nov 1940

Bouvier, Emile Contribution à l'étude des sources du *Siècle de Louis XIV*. (épisode de St. Nombri) *RHL*, 45. 364-71, juil 1938

Brunet, Pierre L'introduction des théories de Newton en France au XVIII^e siècle, t 1 Paris, A Blanchard, 1931 355 p. See pp 231-37, les *Lettres anglaises* de Voltaire

Carcassonne, E, éd Voltaire Le Temple du goût, édition critique. Paris, E Droz, 1938 192 p (Soc textes fr modernes) Reviews G R Havens, *RR*, 31 77-78, Jan. 1940; A Schinz, *MLN*, 54 301, Apr 1939

Carré, J R Réflexions sur *l'Anti-Pascal* de Voltaire. Paris, Alcan, 1935 121 p.

Crist, Clifford M The Dictionnaire philosophique portatif and the early French deists Brooklyn, S. J. Clark's sons, 1934 66 p. Princeton diss.

- Crowley, F. J., ed Critical edition of Voltaire's Poème sur la loi naturelle. Berkeley, Cal, Univ of Calif press, 1938 Pp 177-304 (Publications of the Univ. of California at Los Angeles in languages and literatures, v 1, no. 4) Review. Norman L. Torrey, *ER.*, 31: 181-83, Mar 1940
- David, Jean Les Scythes et les Tartares dans Voltaire et dans quelques-uns de ses contemporains *MLN.*, 53: 1-10, Jan. 1938.
- Davis, Rose Mary Thomson and Voltaire's *Socrate*. *PMLA*, 49 560-65, June 1934.
- Dumesnil, René *Zadig* [comédie musicale par Jean Duperier et A F Hérold] *Mercure*, 285 727-30, 1 août 1938
- Gaiffe, Félix Une parodie inédite de *Zaïre* *Bull. S H Théâtre*, 2 68-76, juil 1934
- La publication et les premières éditions de *Tancrède*. In *Mélanges . . . Joseph Vianey*. Paris, Presses françaises, 1934 513 p Pp 277-89
- Quelques précisions sur *Tancrède* de Voltaire *R universitaire*, 43 (1) 318-38, avril 1934
- Gotô, Souéio, *L'Orphelin de la Chine* et son original chinois *RLC*, 12 712-28, oct-déc 1932
- Havens, George R Composition of Voltaire's *Candide* *MLN.*, 47 225-34, Apr 1932
- Henriot, Emile Voltaire et les *Lettres philosophiques*. *Temps*, 20 oct. 1931.
- Jones, Wm Richmond *L'Ingénu* de Voltaire. Édition critique avec commentaires Paris, E Droz, 1936 142 p Review: Daniel Mornet, *RHL.*, 43 597-99, oct-déc 1936
- Jordens, Wolfgang Die französischen oedipusdramen Bochum, Poppinghaus, 1933 150 p See pp 29-42
- Lantoine, Albert Les Lettres philosophiques de Voltaire Paris, Edgar Malfère, 1931 192 p (Les grands événements littéraires)
- Lee-you, Ya Oun. Le théâtre classique en Chine et en France d'après *L'Orphelin de la Chine* et *L'Orphelin de la famille Tchao* Paris, Presses modernes, 1937 187 p. Thèse, Paris
- Lièvre, Pierre Théâtre *Zaïre* *Mercure*, 251 144-47, 1 avril 1934.
- Loss, H A prototype of the story in *Zadig* Ch III Le chien et le cheval. *MLN.*, 52: 576, Dec. 1937
- Lynch, K M "Pamela Nubile," "L'Écossaise," and "The English merchant" *MLN.*, 47 94-96, Feb 1932.
- Martino, Pierre Quelques notes sur l'histoire et la géographie dans le *Mahomet* de Voltaire In *Mélanges de géographie et d'orientalisme offerts à E F Gautier* Tours, Arrault, 1937 464 p Pp 341-47.
- McGhee, Dorothy M Voltaire's *Candide* and Gracián's *El Criticón* *PMLA*, 52: 778-84, Sept 1937
- Meuron, P de A propos de l'originale de *Candide*. *Bull. Bibl. n s* 17: 479-80, oct 1938.
- Meyerson, Harold. Note on the etymology of names in Voltaire's *Zadig*. *MLN.*, 54. 597-98, Dec. 1939.

- Mornet, Daniel De quelques livres oubliés et pittoresques (*Candide*) *N Litt*, 30 juil 1932 P 3
- Nolte, Fred O Voltaire's *Mahomet* as a source of Lessing's *Nathan der Weise* and *Emilia Galotti* *MLN*, 48 152-56, Mar 1933.
- Patterson, H Temple, ed Critical edition of Voltaire's *Traité de métaphysique* Manchester, Eng, Univ. Manchester univ press, 1937 76 p
- Voltaire's *Traité de métaphysique* *MLR*, 33 261-66, Apr 18.
- Pears, Edith The hound, the bay horse, and the turtle dove a study of Thoreau and Voltaire *PMLA*, 52 863-69, Sept 1937 (*Zadig*)
- Philips, Edith Some changes contemplated by Voltaire in his "Questions sur les miracles" *MP*, 28 360-62, Feb 1931
- Pike, R E Fact and fiction in *Zaire* *PMLA.*, 51 436-39, June 1936
- Platonova, N, ed Voltaire v rabote nad "Istoriyei Rossii pri Petre Velikom," novye materialy Literaturnoye nasledstvo Moscow, 1939 No 33 34, pp 1-24 (Russian text) (New material on Histoire de Pierre le Grand)
- Praag, J A van Une traduction espagnole inconnue du *Brutus* de Voltaire *RLC*, 16 173-80, juin 1936
- * Riva, S *Les Fiancés* de Manzoni et une comédie de Voltaire *Dante*, 1934
- Riva, Serafino *I Promessi sposi* in una commedia di Voltaire (*Le droit du seigneur*) *Nuova antologia*, 367. 156-60, 1 maggio, 1933, *Giornale storico*, 101 100-11, marzo 1933
- Roosbroeck, G. L van The original version of Voltaire's *Temple du Goût* *RR*, 25 324-41, Oct-Dec 1934
- Unpublished poems by Voltaire, Rousseau, Beaumarchais, etc New York, Institute of French studies (1933) 143 p Pp 9-35, 135-43 Review Daniel Mornet, *RHL*, 41 287-88, avril-juin 1934
- Rovillain, Eugène E Rapports probables entre le *Zadig* de Voltaire et la pensée stoïcienne *PMLA*, 52 374-89, June 1937
- Sur le *Zadig* de Voltaire, quelques autres influences *PMLA*, 46 533-39, June 1931
- Stewart, Nancy The *Mahomet* de Voltaire and the *Mahomet* of Henri de Bornier *RR.*, 27 262-68, Oct-Dec 1936
- Stoll, Elmer E. *Œdipus and Othello*. Corneille, Rymer and Voltaire *R Anglo-Américaine*, 12. 385-400, juin 1935 Repr. in his *Shakespeare and other masters* Cambridge, Mass, Harvard Univ press, 1940 430 p See pp 213-29.
- * Styff, H Voltaire's dikt Le Mondain i Sverige. *Nysvenska studier*, 17 210-18, 1937. Harvard
- Tannery, Jean. L'édition originale de *Candide* *Bull. Bibl n s* 12. 7-15, 13 62-70, 17. 246-51, janv 1933, janv 1934, juin 1938.
- L'édition originale de la *Princesse de Babylone*. *Bull. Bibl. n s*. 13 198-203, mai 1934.
- Tiersot, Julien. Voltaire et Rameau collaborateurs. *R musicale*, 17 217-23, sept 1936 (*La Princesse de Navarre*, 1745.)

- Torrey, Norman L The first edition of *Candide* *MLN*, 48· 307-10, May 1933
- Voltaire's composition of *Les adieux du vieillard* *RR*, 30 361-68, Dec 1939
- Treich, Leon Le bicentenaire de *Zaïre* *N Litt*, 6 août 1932, p 4.
- * Van den Borne, E Voltaire, Tancrède et la queielle avec Fréron *R Franco-belgc*, 12 28-36, 93-104, 1932
- Vandérem, Fernand Précisions et conclusions sur l'originale de *Candide* *Bull Bibl n s* 17 289-93, juil 1938
- La véritable originale de *Candide* et les conclusions de M Jean Tannery *Bull Bibl n s* 17 337-44, août 1938
- Voltaire trois pièces qui lui sont attribuées *Intermédiaire*, 100 573, 15 juil 1937
- Von der Muhll, E Une source du *Zadig* de Voltaire *MLN*, 52 268, Apr. 1937.
- Wade, Lia The "Épître à Uranie," [a critical edition] *PMLA*, 47 1066-1112, Dec 1932
- Manuscripts of Jean Meslier's *Testament* and Voltaire's printed *Extrait* *MP*, 30 381-98, May 1933
- Wunstorf, Klara Metrische gestaltungsproblem in Goethe's Mahomet nach Voltaire Dusseldorf, G H Nolte, 1934 46 p Thesis, Bonn

VII. VOLTAIRIANA

A. Iconography

- Aubry, G Jean Jean Huber, ou le Démon de Genève. *R Paris*, 43 (3) 593-626, 807-21, 1, 15 juin 1936
- Brière, G Portrait de Voltaire *Bull Musées de France*, 3 127, 1931
- Buste de Voltaire [en marbre par Houdon] (Illus) *Renaissance*, 14 134, avril 1931
- Campos, D R de Un portrait de Voltaire, par Jean Huber, retrouvé au Vatican *Bulletin du Musée d'art et d'histoire de Genève*, 1939 no 17, pp 105-08
- Un ritrattino del Voltaire dipinto da Jean Huber ritrovato in Vaticano *Rivista d'arte* 2 s, 10 364-78, ott 1938
- Disparition d'une statue de Voltaire (celle de la mairie du ix^e arrondissement) *Mercure*, 246 508-09, 1 sept 1933
- Houdons Voltaire. *Weltkunst*, 1937, Jan 24, p 1
- Iskierski, Stanislas Deux figurines de Voltaire et de Franklin au palais de Lazienki à Varsovie *Gaz Beaux Arts*, 6 série, 11 245-47, Apr 1934.
- Lever de Voltaire *Aesculape*, 27 231, 1937
- Levinson-Lessing, V Khudozhnik Huber i Voltaire Literaturnoye nasledstvo. Moscow, 1939 No. 33-34, pp 935-44. (Russian text)
- Masque de Voltaire en terre cuite par Houdon, illus *Revue de l'Art* (Bull), 62 274, 1932
- Miomandre, Francis de Voltaire est perdu (à propos d'une statue). *N. Litt*, 16 sept. 1933. P. 1

- Pastel mask of Voltaire by Q de la Tour *Magazine of art*, 30 suppl, p. 13, Nov 1937
- Pigalle's bust of Voltaire *American magazine of art*, 22 391, May 1931; *Art News*, v 29, Apr 4 1931
- Reau, Louis Les bustes de Marie Anne Collot. (Buste de Voltaire au Musée de l'Ermitage a Leningrad.) *Renaissance*, 14. 306-12, Nov 1931
- Rogers, Meyric R Pigalle's bust of Voltaire (acquired by the St Louis Art Museum) *Int Studio*, 99 48-50, June 1931.
- Voltaire by Pigalle *Bull City Art Museum, St Louis*, 16 13-15, Apr 1931
- Samuel McIntire's triumph (a bust of Voltaire) *Antiques*, 28 138-40, Oct 1935
- Scharf, Alfred Noch eine unbekannte Voltairebuste von Houdon *Illus Pantheon*, 8 119, Apr 1935
- Stegman, V Corneille i Voltaire v sobranu kamei Ermitazha (Corneille and Voltaire in the collection of cameos in the Hermitage) *Literaturnoye nasledstvo* Moscow, 1939 No 33-34, pp 971-72.
- Terra cotta portrait of Voltaire by Houdon, illus *Parnassus*, Feb. 1937.
- Voltaire assis, par Houdon *Beaux Arts*, 13 Nov 1936, p. 5
- Voltaire coiffé d'un bonnet phrygien (buste attribué à Houdon). *Amour de l'art*, 17 158, avril 1936
- Voltaire retrouvé *N Litt*, 30 sept 1933, p 1.
- Wortley, Clare S Amateur etchers (Thomas Orde's caricature of Voltaire, 1772) *Print collector's Q.*, 19 198-99, July 1932.

B. Literary Miscellanies

- Anecdote of Voltaire (rectius of Bautru). *N&Q*, 175 423, 463; 176: 213, 179-376; Dec 10, 24, 1938, Mar. 25, 1939, Nov. 23, 1940.
- Auden, W. H Voltaire at Ferney (a poem) *Poetry*, 54 119-21, June 1939
- Brevet de la Calotte pour M. de Voltaire de grand batonnier du régiment, poème *Mercure*, 285 576, 1. août 1938
- Crist, C M Voltaire in the eighteenth and nineteenth-century theatre. *MLN.*, 51 145-51, Mar 1936 (Plays about him)
- Davy, Charles. Voltaire (review of film). *Spectator*, 152. 14, Jan 5, 1934
- Dobrée, Bonamy As their friends saw them; biographical conversations London, J Cape (1933) 154 p. Young Voltaire, pp 65-72.
- Forrest, Mark. Voltaire in strange company (Arliss film). *Saturday R*, 157. 27, Jan 6, 1934.
- J. M Voltaire, *Éloge de l'Eucharistie* (Référence à trouver) *Intermédiaire*, 1934, col. 3 (Réponses col 360, 454-55, 694)
- Un mot de Voltaire ("Mentez, mentez toujours, il en restera quelque chose") *Intermédiaire*, 98 959-60, 30 déc 1935
- Puaux, René Candide reçoit le chevalier de Lowenskiold. *Mercure*, 258. 247-56, 1. mars 1935. (Fantaisie à la manière de Voltaire.)

THE APOCRYPHA AND CHAUCER'S *HOUSE OF FAME*

To the long established list of analogues to Chaucer's *House of Fame*¹ I propose still another: the apocalyptic vision of St. John in the New Testament. Though lacking for the most part in instances of verbal similarity, the Revelation of St. John offers a number of suggestive parallels which cannot be dismissed as mere coincidence.

The meagre details of Ovid and Vergil and Boethius are acknowledged to be insufficient to account for the magnificent portrait in the third book of *Lady Fame*.² Rambeau's contention that Chaucer drew his goddess in the image of Mary, mother of God, enthroned in Dante's heaven, is weak, so scattered through the *Divine Comedy* and so dissimilar are the resemblances cited.³ Cummings⁴ has completely disposed of the identification by Koepfel⁵ and Child⁶ of Chaucer's *Fame* with the *Gloria del popolo mondano* of Boccaccio's *Amorosa Visione*.

That Chaucer had the vision of St John in mind when composing the account of the palace of *Fame* in his vision poem is established by the poem itself. In describing the goddess of *Fame* enthroned in the palace, Chaucer borrows Vergil's designation of the deity as many-eyed (*Aeneid*, iv, 180-183). This detail put him immediately in mind of the Revelation account (iv 6) of the four beasts 'full of eyes before and behind' to which he makes reference:⁷

the bestes foure
That Goddes trone gunne honoure
As John writ in th' Apocalips (HF 1384-85.)

¹ See W. O. Sypherd, *Studies in Chaucer's House of Fame*, Chaucer Society, Second Series 39 (1909).

² *Ibid.*, p. 16, see also E. F. Shannon, *Chaucer and the Roman Poets*, Harvard Studies, vii (1929), 118.

³ A. Rambeau, *Englische Studien*, III (1880), 252 ff.

⁴ H. M. Cummings, *The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Works to . . . Boccaccio* (Menasha, Wis., 1916), pp. 21-32, see also Sypherd, *op cit*, p. 111.

⁵ Emil Koepfel, *Anglia*, xiv, n. f. 2 (1892), 233 ff.

⁶ C. G. Child, *MLN*, x (1895), 379-384.

⁷ Rambeau calls attention to Dante's reference to the same Revelation passage in the *Purgatorio* and uses it to establish a relation between the *Divine Comedy* and the *House of Fame*. *Englische Studien*, III, 259

Detailed examination of this section of the *House of Fame* seems to establish a close chain of associative links between the sacred and the profane vision before and after this reference. More of the Revelation than the simple detail of the eyes was in Chaucer's mind when picturing the goddess of Renown. Just before the mention of the "four bestes," Chaucer had been describing the goddess seated upon an imperial throne, her head touching heaven, "Ther as shynen sterres sevene" (HF 1376). The apocalyptic picture of God on his heavenly seat (iv. 2) with "seven lamps of fire burning before the throne," (iv. 5), inevitably came to his mind's eye. Not merely the four beasts surrounding "Goddes trone," then, but the entire throne scene in heaven must have been engrossing Chaucer's thoughts.

Confirmation of this seems implicit in the passages immediately following the reference to Revelation. The description in the Revelation uses precious stones to record the glory of God:⁸

and he that sat [upon the throne] was to look upon like a jasper and a sardine stone and there was a rainbow round about the throne, in sight like unto an emerald (iv 3)

In like wise Chaucer describes the enthroned goddess, but more briefly:

But Lord' the peiry and the richesse
I saugh sitting on this godesse. (HF 1393-4)

The succeeding lines in the poem describing the chorus of the Nine Muses point home again the analogy with the supernal scene:

And Lord' the hevenyssh melodye
Of songes, ful of armonye
I herde about her trone ysonge
That al the paleys-walles ronge' (HF 1395-98)

They seem an echo of the lines of the Revelation describing the celestial choir: "And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne." (v. 11) The voices rise around the exalted goddess of Fame in this 'hevenyssh melodye':

And ever mo eternally,
They songe of Fame, as thoo herd y
"Heryed be thou and thy name,
Goddesse of Renoun or of Fame!" (HF. 1403-06)

⁸ Gloria del popolo mondano in Boccaccio's *Amorosa Visione* is also bejewelled. But see criticism of H. M. Cummings, *op cit*, p. 23

So too, eternally, does the paean sound in the Apocalypse.

And every creature heard I saying, Blessing and honour, and glory,
and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb,
for ever and ever (v 13)

Finally, some similarity is evident in the description of those grouped about the respective thrones. On pillars of metal lined up on either side of Fame's dais stand twelve statues of famed writers of antiquity like Homer, Vergil, Ovid—'folk of digne reverence' (HF 1419 ff). In the apocalyptic vision the throne is flanked by double the number of stations in Fame's hall—twenty-four seats, and "upon the seats I saw four and twenty elders sitting" (iv. 4).

All of these alleged borrowings, it must be noted, are from two successive and connected chapters of the Revelation of St. John, both dealing with a scene in heaven. Further, they have to do with lines in the *House of Fame* which are likewise in close sequence and closely related in theme.

An additional detail in the Revelation, somewhat apart from those details which have been cited, displays a suggestive similarity to certain elements in Chaucer's work. This has to do with the goddess of Fame's trumpeter, Aeolus, god of the winds. Aeolus is the trumpeter who by means of his two trumpets Clere Laude and Sklaundre proclaims to the world the decisions of Fame. A vast throng of supphants

of sondry regiounes
of alleskynnes condiciouns
That dwelle in erthe under the mone
Pore and ryche (HF 1529-32)

presents itself before the capricious goddess, beseeching special consideration. Eight times Aeolus places either his gold or his black trumpet to his lips to spread through the world as decreed by Fame the renown or shame of a particular group of petitioners. No principle of justice governs the goddess' judgments, they are dispensed out of mere whim or arbitrariness.

In the Revelation, the situation is measurably different, but there are significant parallels. In the eighth and ninth chapters of the Testament vision there is a representation of the equitable judgment of heaven. A great multitude gathers in front of the throne, "of all nations, and kindreds, and people and tongues,"

(viii. 9)—good people who receive the gifts of God. For the evil on earth another award is ready. Seven angels with seven trumpets stand before the throne of God as Aeolus stands before the throne of Fame. With blasts of the trumpet each angel in turn sounds the judgment of heaven on things evil, just as Aeolus with successive blasts on his trumpets sounds the judgment of Fame on evil and good alike. As Aeolus trumpeted his tidings that "through the world wente the soun," so the plaguing effects of the angels' blasts penetrate to every corner of the earth. Noteworthy is the resemblance in detail between the description of the fifth angel's trumpet peal and that of the first swelling blast from Aeolus' instrument. The Revelation account relates that the fifth angel sounded his trumpet

And he opened the bottomless pit, and there arose a smoke out of the pit, as the smoke of a great furnace; and the sun and the air were darkened by reason of the smoke of the pit (ix 2)

Similarly, in Chaucer's poem Aeolus begins to blow into his black trumpet "that fouler than the devel was,"

And such a smoke gan out wende
Out of his foule trumpes ende,
Blak, bloo, grenyssh, swartish red
As doth where that men melte led,
Loo, al on high fro the tuel
And therto oo thing saugh I wel,
That the ferther that hit ran,
The gretter wexen hit began,
As dooth the ryver from a welle,
And hyt stank as the pit of helle. (HF 1645-54)

Significant is the agreement in both accounts of such elements as the sounding of the trumpets, the resulting smoke, the comparison with a furnace, the vast extent of the smoke, and the association of the smoke with the pit of hell.

Another set of possible borrowings from the Revelation is to be found in Chaucer's description of the approach to and abode of Lady Fame. The resemblance, however general, between the vision of the New Jerusalem, penultimate chapter of the Revelation, and Fame's dwelling place⁹ is sufficiently marked to give ground

⁹ Neilson considered the details of the New Jerusalem a possible source for a similar palace, that of Venus, in the pseudo-Chaucerian *The Court of Love*. W. A. Neilson, *Harvard Studies*, vi (Boston, 1899), 23.

for the belief that Chaucer here is in debt to the Bible. Since the New Jerusalem could have provided the poet only with suggestions for the setting and palace of the third book, it is evident that Chaucer drew on other sources as well.

The points of similarity are the following.

1 Just as the eagle carries Chaucer aloft and leaves him at the foot of the rock on which Fame's hall stands, so an angel carries away St John to a great and high mountain. As the eagle points out to Chaucer from a distance the site of Fame's House, so the angel shows to John the holy Jerusalem (xxi. 10)

2 Without doubt from Ovid (*Metam.*, XII, 39-41) Chaucer borrowed the detail that the house is situated midway between heaven, earth, and sea. But the vision vouchsafed to John is also of a city "coming down from God out of heaven" (xxi. 2).

3 On the northern side of the hill on which the palace of Fame stands are inscribed the names of folk that achieved great fame "of olde tyme." On the foundations of the wall around the Heavenly City are inscribed the names of the twelve apostles (xxi. 14)

4 On the top of the hill, outside the castle gate, Chaucer details how he heard the harp-playing of Orpheus, Orion, Chiron, Glascurion "and other harpers many oon." Behind them are "many thousand tymes twelve" making "lowde mynstralcies" (HF 1201 ff.) On Mount Zion, in the Revelation, St John describes how he "heard the voice of harpers harping with their harps." Round about are singers to the number of "one hundred and forty and four thousand" (xiv. 2, 3)

5 Fame's palace and the walls and gates around it are exquisitely carved of gold and precious stones. The walls, castle, and tower are of beryl; the gates are of gold, the hall of the palace is of gold, set

Ful of the fynest stones faire

That men rede in the Lapidaire. (HF 1351-2.)

It has been customary to trace the physical detail of the palace of Fame to the manifold palaces described in classical literature¹⁰ their counterparts in mediaeval courts of love,¹¹ and descriptions of the otherworld,¹² or even in Byzantine romances¹³. None of these, however, has absolute claim as a direct source. As close a resemblance as any of these analogues has to the gorgeous dwelling place of Fame is borne by the glittering setting of the Holy City of Revelation. In the New Jerusalem the walls are of jasper, and the city gleams with the light of jasper; the gates are of pearl, the streets of the city are paved with gold. The foundations of the wall of the city are garnished "with all manner of precious

¹⁰ Sypherd, *op. cit.*, p. 135

¹¹ W. A. Neilson, *op. cit.*, pp. 3 ff.

¹² L. H. Loomis, *Modern Philology*, xxv (1927-8), 331 ff.; H. R. Patch, *PMLA*, xxxiii (1918), 601 ff.

¹³ M. Schlauch, *Speculum*, vii (1932), 506 ff.

stones"—twelve are listed—such as indeed men might find in the *Lapidaire*¹⁴

The numerous correspondences of idea and detail exhibited between the Revelation of St. John and the third book of the *House of Fame* suggest that not all the sources for this poem lie far afield. Like Dante and the author of *The Pearl* Chaucer found the material of the Revelation accessible and easily susceptible to treatment in a visionary poem. Characteristically he transformed the material and integrated it with details borrowed from diverse sources. The result is a confluence of literary models in which, to exalt a poetic monstrosity, Scripture and the classics are called upon indiscriminately. The mediaeval poet, it is evident, was no more averse than was John Milton at a later date, to mingling the sacred with the profane.

LEO J. HENKIN

Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, N. Y.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE 1663 EDITION OF *FAUSTUS*

The Tragickall History / of the LIFE and DEATH of / Doctor Faustus. / Printed with New Additions as it is now Act'd With several, / New Scenes, together with the Actors Names / Written by CH. MAR. / [Woodcut of Faustus in his circle and a horned devil kneeling before him] / Printed for W. Gilbertson at the Bible without Newgate, 1663.

So runs the title page of the last of the seventeenth century editions of *Faustus*.¹ Very little attention has been given this

¹⁴ Though it has been generally assumed that the *Lapidaire* mentioned by Chaucer is a French version of Marbode's work, the twelfth century Apocalyptic lapidary ascribed to Philippe le Thaon dealing with the twelve stones of the New Jerusalem was also referred to as *Le Lapidaire*. P. Studer and J. Evans, *Anglo-Norman Lapidaries* (Paris, 1924), pp. 260-261. The Apocalyptic stones are featured in numerous other lapidaries. Joan Evans, *Magical Jewels of the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1922), pp. 74-77, 93, 143, 146.

¹ The catch-phrase "With New Additions" first appeared on the title page of the edition of 1619, it doubtless referred to the extensive modifications which had already been introduced in the edition of 1616, cf. F. S. Boas, *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus* (London, 1932), p. 4. For the "New Scenes" of 1663, see below. The woodcut of 1663 roughly ap-

text, although Tucker Brooke collates its readings and comments on the painstaking care with which "lines and phrases alluding to the deity, to eternal punishment, or to religious scepticism" were excised.² "It may well be," he concludes, "that the text was prepared for acting by strolling companies during the Commonwealth period. We know that *Mucedorus* and other plays were so acted in defiance of Puritan regulations, and such an origin would account for the extraordinary efforts of the editor to remove all moral grounds of offence." F. S. Boas apparently accepts this theory, adding that "Even Sir Henry Herbert, who had resumed after the Restoration his office as Censor, could scarcely have insisted on such sweeping 'reformations'."³

We know, however, of two performances of *Faustus* in 1662, and in all likelihood the text of 1663, "as it is now Act'd," gives us the play as George Jolly's "Licensed Players" had staged it and as Pepys had seen it the year before its publication.⁴ Puritan scruples can, in fact, hardly have been responsible for the major modification of the 1616-31 text, the deletion of the comic scenes at the Papal Court. And it is altogether unlikely that any of the changes were made by Herbert, who was unable to assert his authority effectively.⁵

proximates the one previously used, but the block is obviously new. This edition, like the 1616-31 editions, was printed "at the Bible without Newgate," though the copyright of the play had been transferred from John Wright, who owned it from 1609 to 1631, to W. Gilbertson. There is a copy in the Harvard College Library.

² C. F. Tucker Brooke, *The Works of Christopher Marlowe* (Oxford, 1910), p. 141. All references to the text of *Faustus* are based on Brooke's edition.

³ Boas, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

⁴ Leslie Hotson, *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage* (Cambridge, 1928), pp. 178-9, notes that Dr. Edward Browne saw a production of "Dr. Fostus" in that year at the "Cock Pit in Drewry Lane," given by the "Licens. Players," a term which almost certainly refers to Jolly's company inasmuch as Browne regularly designates Killigrew's company as "K. P." (the King's Players) and Davenant's company, the only other group, was at that time performing at the Duke's Theater. Pepys comments, as of May 26, 1662: "By water to my brother's, and thence to take my wife to the Red Bull, where we saw Dr. Faustus, but so wretchedly done that we were sick of it"; cf. Boas, *op. cit.*, pp. 49-50. The performance at the Red Bull may also have been staged by Jolly's players.

⁵ For an account of Herbert's futile struggle, see Frank Powell and Frank Palmer, *Censorship in England* (London, 1913), pp. 86-93.

By the end of 1660 the real control of the theaters had already passed into the hands of three producers: Thomas Killigrew, Sir William Davenant, and George Jolly. In commissioning these men in his Royal Grants Charles II inveighed against immorality on the stage, advising Killigrew and Davenant that they "peruse all plays that have been formerly written, and . . . expunge all prophanesse and scurrility from the same before they be represented or acted,"⁶ and informing George Jolly that "in regard of the extraordinary Licentiousness that has bin lately used in things of this nature, Our pleasure is that you doe not at any time hereafter cause to be acted or represented any Play, Enterlude or Opera containing any matter of prophanation, scurrility or obscenity."⁷

If it is difficult to take Charles seriously in this professed concern for public morality, we have, for what it is worth, the testimony of Davenant that the King had by 1663 accomplished his purposes:

If to reform the public Mirrour (where
The Dead, to teach their living Race, appear)
May to the People useful prove, even this
(Which but the object of your leisure is
To respite Care, and which successivelie
Three of our last wise Monarchs wish'd to see,
And in a Century could not be wrought)
You, in Three years, have to perfection brought,
If 'tis to height of Art and Virtue grown,
The form and matter is as much your own
As is your Tribute with your Image coin'd.
You made the Art, the Virtue You enjoyn'd⁸

And Richard Flecknoe, speaking in 1664 of the reformed theater, gives Charles the credit, "when after his happy Restauration he took such care to purge it from all vice and obscenity."⁹

The alterations in the 1663 text of *Faustus* may, then, most plausibly be explained as having been in accordance with the terms

⁶ The Royal Grant to Thomas Killigrew, August 21, 1660; see Fowell and Palmer, *op cit*, p. 87.

⁷ The Royal Grant to George Jolly, December 24, 1660; see Hotson, *op. cit*, pp. 177-8.

⁸ *Poem to the King's Most Sacred Majesty* (1663), reprinted by Hotson, pp. 218-9.

⁹ *A Short Discourse of the English Stage* (1664), reprinted by J. E. Spingarn, *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford, 1908), II, 91-6.

of the King's Grant to Jolly. Charles' known proclivity toward Rome was no doubt responsible for the removal of the slapstick scenes at the Vatican, and some of the other excisions also suggest a Catholic taste. For example, the unwillingness of the editor of 1663 to allow that Mephistophilis "saw the face of God" (line 313) may have been due to the Catholic doctrine that Lucifer and his angels were before their fall in a state of "probation."¹⁰ The assertion that Lucifer had been "most dearly lov'd of God" (line 301) thus also met with disapproval; while the idea that God hates Faustus was repudiated (line 442), possibly because it suggests Predestinarianism. A passage which recalls the horrors of the Black Mass was struck out (lines 445-6). A passage which describes Faustus' Guardian Angel as a vehicle of Grace was deleted (lines 1291-4), perhaps with a view to the Catholic belief that the Church alone provides the Necessary Means.¹¹ And for a similar reason, probably, the advice of the Good Angel, "Reade reade the scriptures" (line 101), was dropped. With what Brooke calls "ridiculous prudery" almost all allusions to the Deity, the soul, the body and soul, blood, and damnation were expunged, and with them went such oaths as "zounds," "sbloud," and "Good Lord." Charles would seem to have been interpreted not only as desirous of keeping out of the theater doctrine incompatible with the Roman faith but also as wishing to avoid annoying all sensitive ears.

Who operated upon the text we cannot be sure, but it may have been the producer Jolly himself. There is some reason to think he was Catholic. In any event, he was traveling on the Continent with his company of actors during the years of the King's exile, and is on record as stating that he could not return to England while the wars lasted there.¹² In 1653 his players performed before the Court in Vienna, but he was later refused permission to play in Basle.¹³ After the Restoration he immediately came back to

¹⁰ *Catholic Encyclopedia*, iv, 765, s v "Devil"

¹¹ *Catholic Encyclopedia*, iii, 752, s v "Church"

¹² Hotson, *op cit*, p. 169. On the other hand, his child was baptized in the Lutheran St Sebald Church in Nuremberg, see Hotson, pp. 175-6

¹³ Hotson, p. 171. In 1650 English players, seeking permission to act in Vienna, made a point of the fact that three members of the troop were Catholic, see W. Creizenach, *Die Schauspiele der englischen Komödianten* (Deutsche National-Literatur, xxiii, Berlin and Stuttgart, n. d.), p. xii.

England, no doubt ready to please the King by the most scrupulous attention to his preferences. In his Grant Charles, who may have seen Jolly's company at Frankfurt, declared himself "well informed" of his "art and skill."¹⁴

Jolly's hand may be suspected in one of the "New Scenes," a passage of about 60 lines added to the comedy, at the Inn near Wittenberg, in which the Horse-courser recounts his dealings with Faustus.¹⁵ Dick proposes the Hostess give the roisterers a song, and there follows a good deal of merriment while the beer cans are filled and the "Lanladie"¹⁶ performs. She sings three times, and indeed her songs are the most prominent feature of the scene. We may assume that it was written to give her an opportunity to show her voice. Now Davenant, it is true, had by 1656 introduced theatrical entertainment "by Music" with women singing,¹⁷ but two years earlier in Germany Jolly was already promising the Council of Basle to delight all who love plays "with his well-practised company, not only by means of good instructive stories, but also with repeated changes of expensive costume and a theater decorated in the Italian manner, with beautiful English music and skilful women"¹⁸ Hotson calls him "the first English producer to use the modern stage."¹⁹ He may have been instrumental in persuading Charles of the immorality of allowing men to play women's rôles.²⁰ It seems very likely, at any rate, that it was he who added songs for the Hostess in the production of *Faustus* in 1662.

¹⁴ Hotson, pp 172-3, 178

¹⁵ Cf Brooke, *op cit*, pp 224-5

¹⁶ The earliest instances cited by the *NED* of the use of "landlady" in the sense of "the hostess of an inn, the mistress of a lodging- or boarding-house" are dated 1654 and 1667, respectively

¹⁷ Hotson, *op cit*, pp 149-50

¹⁸ Hotson, *op cit*, p 171. When Jolly returned to England he found, of course, that Davenant had already accustomed the public to similar innovations, but, as Hotson remarks, Jolly's "development of music, scenery, and the use of actresses preceded Davenant's opera by several years."

¹⁹ Hotson, *loc cit*, cf his summation of Jolly's achievement, p 194. If it was Jolly's production of *Faustus* which Pepys described as "so wretchedly done that we were sick of it" (see above, note 4), Hotson's praise of Jolly's work may be excessive.

²⁰ For Charles' opinions on the matter, see his Grant to Davenant, January 15, 1663, in Hotson, pp 217-8

There is also the "New Scene" at the Court of the Sultan of Babylon, which supplants the scenes at the Papal Court in the earlier editions.²¹ It is introduced by a curious patchwork of passages which, though printed as verse, seem to be chiefly prosy reductions from the 1616-31 texts.²² Some lines are altered to fit the different situation,²³ and Mephistophilis' opening speech, which serves to locate the scene, is almost wholly new. The main body of the scene should have been printed as prose; no ingenuity could scan these lines. The type-setter must have been working from manuscript, perhaps in Jolly's hand; he allowed himself entire freedom in breaking up the prose before him. Here and elsewhere in the text he was guilty of innumerable petty errors, such as the botching of the spelling of proper names.²⁴

The scene really gets under way with the "Welcome, Mephostophilis" of the Sultan Solomane, which is a patent blunder for "Welcome, Mustapha," since the Sultan is addressing the Bashaw of that name.²⁵ We have forthwith a strange extension of the action of the *Jew of Malta*. Mustapha and Caleph report (prematurely) the victory of the Sultan's forces at Malta through the Jew's aid. Some lines are plagiarized from the text of the *Jew*,²⁶ and there are some notable inaccuracies.²⁷ Jolly must have in-

²¹ Brooke, pp 198-202

²² Lines 803-812 (p 198) derive from lines 803-5 (p 172) and lines 839-45 (p 173), lines 822-3 (p 198), from lines 864-5 (p 203); lines 824-40 (p 198) from lines 868-88 (p 203), lines 842-61 (pp. 198-9) from lines 1011-30 (pp 206-7)

²³ E g, "Turk" (line 831, p 198) is substituted for "Pope" (line 875, p 203), "Babylon" (line 840, p. 198) for "Rome" (line 888, p. 203), "Bashawes" (line 860, p 199) for "Friars" (line 1028, p 207)

²⁴ E g, "Tyre" (line 805, p. 198) for "Trier", "Oenus" (line 638, p 166) for "Enons"

²⁵ Line 862, p 199 Solyman and Mustapha are important characters in the celebrated *Siege of Rhodes* (1656), and probably Jolly borrowed the names from that source, though they are elsewhere paired in story and drama.

²⁶ E g, line 877 (p 199) derives from line 236 (p 247), lines 877-8 (p 199) derive from lines 247-8 (p. 247), line 880 (p 199) derives from line 258 (p 248); line 881 (p 199) from line 302 (p 249) References to the *Jew* are based on Brooke's edition

²⁷ E. g, "months" (line 877, p 199) for "years" (line 236, p 247); "Martine Belbosco" (line 884, p. 199) for "Martin del Bosco" (line 724, p. 260).

tended something like dramatic irony, for the *Jew* ends, of course, with the destruction of the forces of Selim-Calymath and his imprisonment as a guarantee of Malta's freedom. If the audience was unfamiliar with the play, Jolly's introduction of such material would have been almost pointless. We note that the tricks played by Faustus when the Empress joins the company for the celebration, are not very different from those employed at the Pope's Court, and they were no doubt inspired by them.

We have no positive information that the *Jew* was at any time a part of Jolly's repertoire, but *Faustus* and the *Jew* were sometimes paired on the Continent.²⁸ Jolly may have reintroduced both plays in England on the Restoration stage. It seems likely, at all events, that the 1663 edition of *Faustus* is his text, prepared in deference to the terms of his Grant from the King.

The University of Iowa

SEYMOUR M. PITCHER

THE LADDER OF LECHERY, *THE FAERIE QUEENE*,

III, 1, 45

As Britomart, the knight of Chastity, is riding on her adventures, she encounters six knights. She learns that they serve one lady, and that all knights they encounter must swear to serve her or combat with them. Britomart chooses the combat, and overcomes the six with ease. She then accompanies them to Castle Joyous, the abode of Malecasta, the Lady of Delight. Britomart finds that life in the castle is wholly given over to "lascivious desport," presided over by Malecasta, the allegory of Unchastity. The six knights who have been conquered, the champions of Unchastity, are called, in order, Gardante, Parlante, Jocante, Basciante, Bacchante, and Noctante. These names may be translated as Looking, Speaking, Toying, Kissing, Revelling, and Spending the Night. "To faire Britomart they all but shadows beene," as of little moment to Chastity.¹ No adequate explanation of them seems to have been given.

²⁸ Both plays were given in Dresden in 1626, and in Prague in 1651, see Creizenach, *op cit*, p. xxxiii

¹ Later in the narrative the first knight, Gardante, does wound Britomart slightly, and provokes a violent reaction (st. 65). This perhaps signifies by allegory that only the first stage of lasciviousness can affect Chastity, and that only to rouse resistance

A similar but shorter series occurs in the *Persones Tale* of Chaucer; it has in it much of Spenser's moral intention:

This is that other hand of the devel, with fyve fingres, to cacche the peple to his vileinye The first finger is the fool lookinge of the fool womman and of the fool man, that sleeth, right as the basilicock sleeth folk by the venom of his sighte; for the covertise of eyen foloweth the covertise of the herte The seconde finger is the vileyns touchinge in wikkede manere, and therfore seith Salomon, that who-so toucheth and handleth a womman, he fareth lyk him that handleth the scorpoun that stingeth and sodeynly sleeth thurgh his envenyminge The thridde, is foule wordes, that fareth lyk fyr, that right anon brenneth the herte. The fourthe finger is the kissinge, and trewely he were a greet fool that wolde kisse the mouth of a brenninge ovne or of a fourneys The fifthe finger of the develes hand is the stinkinge dede of Lecherie Certes, . with hise fyve fyngres of Lecherie [the feend] gripeth [man] by the reynes, for to throwen him in-to the fourneys of helle (852-62)

Something akin to this is to be found in one of the English versions of the *Secretum Secretorum*, made in 1422 by James Yonge, and called the *Governaunce of Princes*. The king is advised as follows:

In vyue thyngis ye shal kepe you fro lechurye,
whyche ben prowid by this two versis

Colloquium, visus, contactus, basia, risus
Sunt fomites ² veneris, hec fuge, salvus eris
Speche, syght, touchyng, kyssyng, laghyng,
These byth the norchynges of lechurie, enchu
ham, and thow shalte be sawid ³

Here is a series of acts leading toward lechery somewhat like that of Spenser, though in a less logical order. Likewise in a mediaeval students' song occurs the verse.

Tantum volo ludere,
tantum contemplari,
presens volo tangere,
tandem osculari,
quantum, quod est agere,
nolo suspicari ⁴

² *Fomites* are pieces of kindling wood or tinder Cf *F Q.* 3. 1. 50. 2:
"a cole to kindle fleshly flames"

³ E E T S. (London, 1898), pp. 138-9. Cf *Paradise Lost* 10. 992-4:

"But if thou judge it hard and difficult,
Conversing, looking, loving, to abstain
From Love's due Rites, Nuptial embraces sweet!"

⁴ *Carmina Burana* (Stuttgart, 1847), p. 151

Here the arrangement in an ascending series is still clearer. Possibly the idea is derived from Lucian's

It is not enough for the lover to see the loved one sitting near him and speaking, but as though Love had made a ladder of voluptuousness, first he has put the rung of sight, that the lover may see; and if he sees, then he will proceed to touch, and then if he touches lightly with his fingertips feelings of delight run over his whole body. If he easily attains this, he essays his third attempt, that of kissing, he is not too forward at once, but approaches the lips a little with his lips, which he draws back before they fully touch, without leaving a trace of his true purpose. After this he goes on as he can to more eager caresses, and even opens his mouth a little. He leaves neither of his hands idle, visible embraces that do not disturb the clothing bring pleasure, or his right hand softly slipped into the bosom strokes breasts naturally little rounded, and touches evenly all parts of the smooth belly, and after that the early down of the flower of Hebe.—But

Why is it needful for me to tell what is best hidden? ⁵

That this passage ever came under Spenser's eye cannot be asserted; he quotes Lucian in the *View*,⁶ and, in jest, indicated a desire to have Gabriel Harvey's edition of Lucian in four volumes.⁷ The latter often refers to Lucian in his *Marginalia*.

But whether Spenser is adapting a passage from Lucian or not, it is evident that his six knights form a series that may be called *scalae voluptatis*. Beginning with the eye, so often associated with love by mediaeval writers, the course of desire goes along an ascending scale to its culmination. Lucian's concept would, it seems, have been acceptable to the Renaissance, though I have found no reference to it before one in the amplified edition of Cesare Ripa's *Iconologia* published in 1613.⁸ Spenser may have devised for himself the ascending scale of lechery. But whatever the source of that idea, the personal allegory of the six knights results from the chivalric character of his poem joined with his desire to make the moral instruction it conveys as vivid as possible. He could doubtless have extended it to make it more impressive in itself, but that

⁵ Lucian, *Amores*, 53. The last line is from Euripides, *Orestes*, 14.

⁶ Globe ed., p. 634. Spenser is not accurate, he speaks of an oath by fire and sword, but the original has wind and sword.

⁷ G. C. Moore Smith, *Gabriel Harvey's Marginalia* (Stratford-upon-Avon, 1913), p. 23. The edition of the complete works of Lucian, with a Latin translation, published at Basel in 1563, is in four volumes.

⁸ Part 2, p. 120.

would have meant replanning the poem to take the ladder of lechery from the subordinate place where he was satisfied to leave it.

ALLAN H. GILBERT

Duke University

SIR THOMAS ELYOT AGAINST POETRY

Elyot's defence of poetry in *The Governour* (1531) has been discussed at some length.¹ No attention seems to have been given, however, to the apparent "retraction" in *The Defence of Good Women*, first published in 1540, in which Elyot refutes, in one-two-three order, several of the most important arguments set forth in the *Governour* chapter. The passage is:

The authors whom ye so moche do set by, for the more part were poetes, which sort of persōs among the latines & grekes were neuer had but in smal reputatiō. For I could neuer rede that in any weale publike of notable memory, Poetes were called to any honorable place, office, or dignite. Plato out of the publike weale whiche he had deuysed, wolde haue all poetes vtterly excluded. Tulli wolde not haue in his publyke weale any poetes admitted. The cause why they were soo lyttell esteemed was, for as moche as the more parte of theyr inuencions consysted in leasynges, or in sterynge vp of wanton appetytes, or in pouryng oute, in raylynge, theyr poyson of malyce. For with theyr owne goddes and goddeses were they so malaparte, that with theyr aduoutries they fylled great volumes.²

The speaker of this attack is Candidus, who defends good women against the "barkynge" of the "curre" Caninius. Since the purpose of the dialogue is to defend women, Candidus, I judge,

¹ See particularly Theodore Stenberg, "Sir Thomas Elyot's Defense of the Poets," *University of Texas Studies in English*, No. 6 (1926), 121-45; D. T. Starnes, "Notes on Elyot's *The Governour*," *RES.*, III (1927), 37-46.

² Sir Thomas Elyot, *The Defence of Good Women*, ed. Edwin Johnston Howard (Oxford, Ohio, 1940), pp. 13-14. On page ix of this edition occurs a misstatement: "This present edition is the third, the work not having been printed since 1545 until now." Mr. Howard's edition is actually the fifth to my knowledge. Foster Watson published a slightly abridged version in his *Wives and the Renaissance Education of Women* (New York, 1911), pp. 211-39; and Alois Brandl edited the complete *Defence* in the *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, vol. II. Watson's and Brandl's editions are from the 1545, or 2nd, edition.

may be taken as Elyot himself. He has completely backtracked from his position in *The Governour*, where he says.

. *the name of a poete*, wherat nowe, (specially in this realme,) men haue suche indignation, that they use onely poetes and poetry in the contempte of eloquence, *was in auncient tyme in hygh estimation* in so moche that all wysdome was supposed to be therein included wherby men from their childhode were brought to the raison howe to lyue well . . . *as it shall be manifeft to them that shal be so fortunate to rede the noble warkes of Plato and Aristotle, wherein he shall fynde the autoritie of poetes frequently alleged* . .

But sens we be nowe occupied in the defence of Poetes, it shall nat be incongruent to our mater to shewe what profite may be taken from the diligent reding of auncient poetes, *contrary to the false opimon, that nowe cometh, of them that suppose that in warkes of poetes is containyd nothyng but baudry*, (*suche is their foule worde of reproche*,) and unprofitable leasinges³

Lest the impression be made that Elyot was a sort of Tudor Jekyll-and-Hyde, a combination of Sidney and Gosson, it is only fair to add that in reply to Caninius' question as to why he sets "soo lyttell by poetes and poetry," Candidus admits that "if they make verses conteynyng quicke sentences, voyd of rybauldry, or in commendation of vertue, some praty allegory, or do set forthe any notable story, than do I set by thē as they be well worthy."⁴

I am not certain the attack indicates that Elyot had changed his attitude toward poetry. In both attack and defence Elyot uses very conventional arguments,⁵ and I am inclined to think that in both Elyot was writing, not from any deep-seated love or hatred for poetry, but simply as his subject matter required. The apology for poetry was not new to the courtesy book.⁶ As for the attack in *The Defence of Good Women*, the fact that Elyot felt it necessary to attack poetry proves—though such proof, of course, is

³ Sir Thomas Elyot, *The Boke Named the Governour*, ed H. H. S. Croft (London, 1883), I, 120-23

⁴ Sir Thomas Elyot, *op cit*, pp. 17-18.

⁵ All of Elyot's objections, for example, are contained in the fourth chapter of Agrippa's *De Incertitudine et Vanitate Omnium Scientiarum et Artium*

⁶ Besides the conversations on poetry in Castiglione, note the defence of poetry in Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini's *De Liberorum Educatione* (in W. W. Woodward, *Vittorino da Feltre and Other Humanist Educators*, Cambridge, 1897, p. 149).

hardly needed—that poets had said bad things about women. The appearance, in the writings of one man, of a defence of poetry and an attack on poetry surely does not point toward great sincerity in either instance. Rather it implies, I feel, that the author was following a convention.

GEORGE B. PACE

The University of Virginia

CHAPMAN AND PHAER

A book that probably should be added to the known reading of George Chapman is Thomas Phaer's translation of the first ten books of the *Aeneid* (1558-1562). Chapman was likely to reveal his reading either by direct, and usually disputatious, reference, or by unacknowledged borrowing, and although I find no evidence that he had so much as looked at his one English predecessor in the Homeric field, Arthur Hall, who in 1581 had brought out a miserable translation from Sale's French of the first ten books of the *Iliad*, I do see signs of his knowing Phaer's Virgil. This is not to say, either, that he had necessarily read much of the translation itself, but that he had at least looked over the book and read Phaer's critical Conclusion. Although most of the material in Chapman's prefaces and glosses is modelled in brief after that of the French commentator Spondanus (1583), there are echoes from Phaer.

Chapman never mentions Phaer by name, but a telltale phrase crept into print at the end of the Twelfth Booke of his *Odysseys*. At that point appear the mysterious words, "Opus novem dierum," a phrase which has puzzled editors of Chapman's Homer and which caused Coleridge to write in his copy that, if Chapman had translated the twelve books in nine days, it would have been a "nine day's wonder." The wonder is, I believe, dissipated by a look at Phaer's *Aeneid*. It was a habit of Phaer to note at the end of each book of the *Aeneid* the date on which he finished translating it, and the number of days it had taken him. This practice was kept up by Thomas Twynne, who continued the work. Thus, we can compose from Phaer's Virgil the following amusing schedule.

Book I.	Opus II dierum	6
II.	Opus viginti dierum.	
III	Opus viginti dierum.	
IV.	Opus Quindecim dierum	
V	Opus xxiiij dierum.	
VI	Opus triginta dierum	
VII	Opus xij dierum	
VIII	Opus xl dierum per interualla	
IX	Opus 30 dierum	
X	Inchoatum per Thomam Phaer, finitum Londini per Thomam Twynum, 23 Maij 1573. Opus 7 dierum per interualla	

By comparison, it looks very much as if it had taken Chapman nine days to translate the twelfth book of the *Odyssey*, not all twelve books, and that he jotted down the phrase in emulation of Phaer. The Douce copy of the very rare *Odysseys* (twelve books, n. d., 1614) bears Chapman's autograph inscription to Sir Henry Fanshawe, and in this copy the "Opus novem dierum" is heavily inked out: Chapman would seem heartily to have disclaimed the misleading boast which had crept into print. The words appear, however, in all copies.

Chapman indeed seems to have known Phaer from the outset of his Homeric ventures, as early as 1598, if not before. In that year were printed the first *Seauen Bookes of the Iliades*, as well as the passage, *Achilles Shield*. Phaer too had started with seven books, and the apologies of the older translator rang in Chapman's memory as he started to bring out his translation piecemeal. This is only natural, for Virgil, the rival epic poet, was first on the English scene; he too had been turned into fourteeners; and the champion of Homer would naturally consult the English Virgil which he must outdo if he was to advance Homer's claims to their rightful place. (It was not particularly difficult to write better than Phaer.)

The echoes are neither verbal nor tonal: Phaer was diffident about his work, Chapman, self-assured. They are reminiscences of the actual matter contained in Phaer's Conclusion, which was printed with the seven books of 1558 and retained in subsequent editions. (1) Phaer starts with a defense of his mother tongue, the first suggestion of such a defense among all the sixteenth century translators.¹ Chapman embarks on such a defense in both

¹H. B. Lathrop, *Translations from the Classics into English from Causton to Chapman, 1477-1620*, University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, xxxv (Madison, 1933), p. 108.

the preface and the dedication to *Achilles Shield*, and carried the argument further when he brought out the first twelve books of the *Iliads* in 1609. (2) Phaer, like Chapman, says he will go on with his work if encouraged. (3) Phaer follows Horace in his theory of translation and says he had to "expound" somewhat. Chapman makes the same apology in the prefaces to the *Seaueu Bookes* (1598) and the complete *Iliads* (1611), and, like Phaer, (4) hopes that he will be pardoned for what in his first labors may be unnecessarily paraphrastic. (5) They both apologize on the grounds of haste for not revising all their work. Chapman tells us that he spent only fifteen weeks on his last twelve books (Preface, 1611); Phaer took two hundred and two days for nine books. (6) In publishing their first seven books, they both promise to revise their work in the next edition, and (7) both conclude by begging the reader to correct the printer's errors. There are too many points in common between Chapman's several prefaces and dedications and Phaer's one short Conclusion to allow the assumption that Chapman worked in ignorance of his epic predecessor.

Russell Sage College

PHYLLIS BROOKS BARTLETT

JACQUES' "SEVEN AGES" AND PEDRO MEXIA

A short time ago, Professor Draper published a note on Shakespeare's seven divisions of life in which he pointed out that this was an unusual number and suggested that *Batman uppon Bartolome's* section on this subject was the source.¹ Professor Gilbert replied that another source might be Censorinus' *De Die Natali Liber* and that the "seven ages" were probably more conventional than Professor Draper would have us believe.² To this discussion I should like to add my mite.

In 1542 Pedro Mexia published a *lectio* to which he gave the title *Silva de varia lecion*. There were various editions of this book in Spain, and in 1552 Claude Gruget translated it into French with the title *Les Diverses leçons de Pierre Messis*. The French

¹ "Jacques 'Seven Ages' and Bartholomaeus Anglicus," *MLN*, LV (1939), 273-276

² "Jacques' 'Seven Ages' and Censorinus," *MLN*, LV (1940), 103-105

translation was extraordinarily popular and was reprinted in 1556, 1569, 1572, 1577, 1583, 1584, 1592, 1604, 1609, 1610, 1616, and 1643. It inspired French scholars to such an extent that when Antoine du Verdier brought out his *Les Diverses Leçons* in 1577, he described them as "suivans celles de Pierre Messie." Mexia's book was obviously popular and easy to be had.

Chapter forty of Mexia's *lectio* discusses the ages of man, I cite the important passages from the French translation which would be best known to Englishmen.

Par la commune diuision des Astrologues Arabes, Caldees, Grecs & Latins, & particulièrement de Procle auteur Grec, Ptolomee, & Alibeu Raselle, la vie humaine est diuisee en sept aages Le premier aage se nomme Enfance, contenant l'espace de quatre ans duquel le corps est humide, delicate, tendre, foible, mobile . . . ses membres pour un bien petit de trauail s'afoblissent & croissent leurs corps en peu de temps & à veue d'oeil Le second aage dure dix ans, en sorte qu'il vient iusques à quatorze, lequel les Latins ont nommé *Pueritia*, qui donne fin à l'enfance, & commencement à l'adolescence. Car lors les ieunes enfans font quelque principe de la monstre de leurs exprints, soit en lisant, escrivant, ou chantant & sont lors tractables & dociles, toutesfois legers en leurs pipos, inconstans & muables Le tiers aage est de huict ans, nommé par les anciens, Adolescence, & se continue depuis quatorze iusques a vingtdeux accomplis. . . . Car l'homme alors commence à estre prompt par la nature, habile, & puissant pour engendrer estant enclin à l'amour & aux dames, adonné à la musique, au ieu aux voluptez, banquets, & plaisirs mondains . . . Le quatrieme aage se poursuit iusques à ce que l'homme ait quarante deux ans accomplis, & s'appelle Ieunesse, le cours de laquelle dure dix neuf ans. . . . Semblablement cest aage est le prince de tous les autres, & fleur de la vie, durant laquelle les sentimens & puissances du corps & de l'esprit tiennent, & aquierent leur entiere force & lors estant l'homme bien entendu, & hardi, fait conoistre & eslire le bien il desire & pourchasse richesses, d'estre excellent, & renommé, tousiours enclin à bien faire . . . Le cinquieme aage nommé Viril, a quinze ans de duree par ainsi va sa poursuite iusques à l'an cinquantesixieme . . . inclinant les hommes à l'avarice, & les rendant coleres, maladifs, temperez au boire & manger, & constans en leurs faits Puis en aioustant douze a cinquantesix, vous trouuerez soixantehuict ans, qui font la fin du sixieme aage, nommé Viellesse. . . . Les hommes en ce temps font toutes oeuvres saintes, aiment la temperance & la charité, apètent l'honneur acompagné de louange: sont honnestes, & craignans honte & deshonneur. Le septiesme & dernier des sept aages, à este limité depuis soixantehuict, iusques à quatre vingts & huict, & peu de gens se treuuent qui y paruenent Il se nomme Caduc & Decrepit . . . Il afoblit leur memoire & leur force, puis les charge d'ennuis, longues tristesses, maladies langoureuses . . . Et si quelqu'un

se trouue qui parviene au dessus de cest aage . . vous conoistrez qu'il deuendra & retournera comme en enfance ³

Could Shakespeare have known Mexia's book? Certain chapters in this book which deal with the Turks, Mahomet, and Tamburlaine furnished Marlowe with source material and Shakespeare may have known this. Then, too, in 1613 William Jaggard published Thomas Milles' *The Treasure of Auncient and Moderne Times*, which is a great compendium of diverse learning translated from Mexia, Du Verdier, Sansovino, and others. The fifteenth chapter of the fourth book of Milles' *Treasure* is an abridgement of Mexia's chapter on the "seven ages." Now we know that this book was slow to appear. In his dedication to Sir Thomas Brudenell, Milles apologizes for his own delay, later Milles laments a further delay in publication, for Jaggard's youthful indiscretions cost him his sight at about this time. There is no entry for the *Treasure* in Arber's *Transcript*, so we do not know when the manuscript was ready. It might go back to the turn of the century in which case Shakespeare might have heard of Mexia through Jaggard or Milles. This is, however, only a conjecture; the important thing is that there is another source, and a very popular source, for Jacques' "seven ages."

DON CAMERON ALLEN

Duke University

MACDUFF, NOT MACBETH

Mr. Hazelton Spencer, in his *The Art and Life of William Shakespeare* (p. 336), speaks of *Macbeth* as a "tragedy of a normal man who becomes a criminal." Of the thane of Glamis himself he says, "Even after he embarks on his career of crime, he is no casehardened brute," and he cites as his evidence:

I cannot strike at wretched kerns, whose arms
Are hir'd to bear their staves

However, these lines (v, vii, 17-18) are not said by Macbeth

³ *Op. cit.* (Lyons, 1592), pp 167-170, the rest of the chapter treats of the various stages of life according to Pythagoras, Marcus Varro, Hippocrates, Solon, Saint Isidore, Horace, Aristotle, Avicenna, and Servius Tullius. Censorinus and Galen are also mentioned

but by Macduff, while he searches for Macbeth before the castle at Dunsinane. Therefore they cannot be used as evidence of mercy in Macbeth's character, of merely royal condescension, or of any other redeeming quality.

We are left the tyrant (v, vii, 14), the fatalist (v, v, 48-51, v, viii, 17-18), the remorseless husband (v, v, 17-28), the anti-social bully (v, iii, 11-19), the impotent sovereign (v, ii, 14-22), the ruthless oppressor (iv, i, 150-54), the suspicious eavesdropper (iii, iv, 131-32), the near-lunatic (iii, iv, 93-96), the blackest of hypocrites (iii, ii, 30-35; iii, i, 30-34), and the most cold-blooded of murderers (iii, ii, 54).

It would seem then that the Macbeth of the last three acts—from the death of Duncan to the end—is wholly bad, and that, if Shakespeare, as well as Aristotle, had discovered "that the ruin of a complete villain does not awaken tragic emotions," as Professor Douglas Bush points out in his notes on *Macbeth* (p. 294), we must look entirely to the first of the play for any alleviatory qualities in the protagonist's character.

JAMES J. LYNCH

Arizona State Teachers College

The error which Mr. Lynch points out was noticed immediately after completion of the first printing and the plate was corrected, that is, the quotation from Macduff's speech was deleted. The conclusion, however, was allowed to stand. Macbeth is not another Richard III. Even after he embarks (i, vii, 79-80) on his career of crime, he is not completely callous. That may not make him any better, but it encourages the audience to suffer with him. His immediate remorse after the murder of Duncan and the repeated glimpses of his mental anguish throughout the remainder of the play are sufficient evidence that Macbeth is not insensible. Savage as are his orders for the extermination of Macduff's family, he can still speak (iv, i, 152) of "unfortunate" souls—there is nothing ironical or gloating about that adjective. The passage beginning "I have liv'd long enough" (v, iii, 22-28) is not, in its awareness of a life's failure, the speech of a case-hardened brute; and "poor heart" in its last line may be compared with "unfortunate souls." I am obliged to Mr. Lynch for his commentary, I am in entire agreement with him on the wickedness of that bad man Macbeth, but I do not think Macbeth's wickedness is the main point

H. S.

THE ELIZABETHAN TRANSLATION OF VEGETIUS'
DE RE MILITARI

The Elizabethan era saw the publication of over sixty books on the art of war and martial discipline. Although the details in many of these works were borrowed from foreign critics, only thirteen were actual translations from continental sources, and but two of these thirteen were from the ancient technical writers. John Sadler published one of them under the title *The Foure bookes of Flavius Vegetius Renatus* (1572). One is inclined to ask what there was about *De re militari*, composed in the fourth century A.D., that should recommend it to the English reader of the sixteenth century. Apparently John Sadler saw in it a criticism of martial affairs that could be accurately applied to the English military situation. A great evil hampered the adequacy of the Elizabethan army. Rogues were mustered into the service, incompetently trained, and placed under the command of officers who, having obtained their positions by flattery, quite often knew nothing of the art of war. It is no wonder that Sadler should believe that *De re militari* contained a message for Englishmen, for Vegetius condemned the very evils which had plagued Tudor armies for over half a century.¹

First of all, Vegetius asserted that "An Army raised without proper Regard to the Choice of its Recruits, was never yet made good by Length of Time," and he placed the blame for a succession of martial defeats upon the shoulders of negligent and careless muster-masters. Secondly, he stated that discipline and military

¹ For biting indictments of these evils, see Barnabe Rich, "A Right Excelent and Pleasaunt Dialogue betweene Mercvry and an English Souldier," quoted in "The Honestee of This Age," *Percy Society*, xi (1844), vii, Robert Barret, *The Theorike and Practike of Moderne Warres* (1598), pp 7, 23; letter from Thomas Digges, Muster-Master General in the Low Countries, to Walsingham, *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series*, xx, 278, Thomas Digges, *Englands Defence* (London, 1680), p. 5; Thomas and Dudley Digges, *Foure Paradoxes* (London, 1604), p. 27; *Letters of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries* (Southampton, 1921), pp 123-127; Sir Henry Knyvett, *The Defence of the Realme* (Oxford, 1906), pp 34, 61, even Stephen Gosson, *The Schoole of Abuse* (Westminster, 1895), p 34, and *A Larvm for London* (Malone Society Reprints, 1913), lines 47-54.

training were of paramount importance in the creation of an efficient fighting force, maintaining that the old Roman legions owed their successes, not to "Numbers or mere Courage," but to "an unwearied Cultivation of the . . . Arts of War." Finally, he criticized the obtaining of positions by officers through "Interest and Favor," with the resulting decline in the "Strength and Substance" of the army. Commands, he said, should go to soldiers as "the Recompences of Merit and long Service."²

Accordingly, Vegetius, although an ancient technical writer who condemned practices which made the Roman army of his day far inferior to the legions of old, coincidentally censured three of the major imperfections in the Elizabethan army. John Sadler, aware of this coincidence, translated and published *De re militari* as a guide and warning to his queen and council, no doubt hoping that, through his efforts, the recruiting, training, and disciplining of troops would in some measure be improved.

HENRY J. WEBB

The Citadel

GIL POLO, DESPORTES, AND LYLY'S "CUPID AND MY CAMPASPE"

R. W. Bond¹ recognized as the original of "Cupid and my Campaspe" the sonnet "Vn iour l'aueugle Amour, Diane, & ma Martresse," in Desportes' *Diane*.² Bond undoubtedly suspected the originality of any of Desportes' poems, but did not, apparently, recognize the source of Desportes' archery contest. I have found that source in the last poem, a sonnet, in Gaspar Gil Polo's *La Diana enamorada*, the sonnet "Probaron en el campo su destreza."³ Bartholomew Yong, in his translation of the three parts of the *Diana*, translated the sonnet with slightly less variation from the Spanish than one finds in Desportes's version:

² Lieut. John Clark, *Military Institutions of Vegetius* (London, 1767), pp. 5-6, 15, 51-2.

¹ "Lyly's Songs," *RFS*, vi (1930), 296. I tacitly accept Bond's contention that Lyly wrote the song for the play in which it appears. Cf. Bond's *The Complete Works of John Lyly* (1902), II, 549.

² *Les Œuvres de Phillippe Desportes* (Lyons, 1606), Livre I, p. 17.

³ *Nueva biblioteca de autores españoles*, VII, 398.

Diana, Loue, and my faire Shepherdesse,
 Did in the field their chiefest cunning trie,
 By shooting arrowes at a tree neere by,
 Whose barke a painted hart did there expresse.
Diana stakes her beautie merciesse,
Cupid his bowe, *Argia* her libertie
 Who shewed in her shot a quicker eie,
 A better grace, more courage, and successe
 And so did she *Dianas* beautie win,
 And *Cupids* weapons, by which conquer'd prize
 So faire and cruell she hath euer bin,
 That her sweete figure from my wearied eies,
 And from my painfull hart her cruell bowe
 Haue stolne my life and freedome long agoe *

If we allow that the translation of the *Diana* was completed in 1583 as Yong claimed, and that the manuscript was in circulation soon after, any of the three versions might have served as Lyly's inspiration. Bond's reference to the "French grace" of Lyly's song is not amiss, but the comparison, at his request, of Desportes' last line, "Ainsi sur moy chetif tombe toute la perte," with Lyly's final couplet does not yield any verbal echoes to prove that the French, and not the Spanish or the English, is the "original." The ending of the Spanish sonnet is as close a parallel. Line 9 of the French, beginning "Las! Madame gaigna," is closer than anything in the other versions to Lyly's curt phrases "Cupid paid, Loses them too, She paid." But Lyly's song, with concert growing gracefully out of concert, took no more than a hint from any original.

ERNST G. MATHEWS

The University of Illinois

JOHN DONNE'S "LITTLE RAG"

The motto, "Antes muerto que mudado," borrowed with a change of gender from Montemayor, and used on Will. Marshall's engraving, which appears as frontispiece in Donne's *Poems* (1635), has been taken as evidence that Donne knew the *Diana* of Montemayor. Consequently, when Donne wrote to Sir Robert Ker, I beginne to bee past hope of dying: And I feele that a little ragge of *Monte Magor*, which I read last time I was in your Chamber, hath wrought

* *Diana* (1598), p. 495.

prophetically upon mee, which is, that Death came so fast toward¹ mee, that the over-joy of that recovered mee,¹

nothing more logical than to seek the source of the allusion in the *Diana*. There Mr. T. E. Terrill found a passage to his satisfaction:

amor que lastimandome
Jamás canso, no impide el acordarseme
De tanto mal, y muero en acordandome
Mire a Diana, y vi luego abreviarseme,
El plazer y contento, en solo viendola,
Y a mi pesar la vida vi alargarseme

Love which tormenting me
Never took rest, hinders me not the remembering
Such a great sickness, I die in recalling it
I looked at Diana, and saw then my cutting short;
Contentment and pleasure was only in seeing it,
And to my grief then, I saw life lengthening²

But the case for the parallel, I have long felt, is shaky, for the reason that nothing in the Spanish but the word *muero* and the phrase *la vida vi alargarseme* is even echoed by Donne. Terrill's translation of lines 4-6 is in error and is arbitrary in its punctuation, Bartholomew Yong gave a substantially correct version:

Diane I sawe, but straight my ioy was fading me,
When to my onely sight she was opposing her
And (to my greefe) I saw long life inuading me³

The correct reading of *her* for *it* in line 5 emphasizes the dissimilarity of context between the out-and-out love complaint and the letter; and Donne quite clearly implies a similar context.

A bit of verse which is almost translated by Donne's clause, "that Death came so fast towards me, that the over-joy of that recovered mee," does come to hand in Montemayor, not in his *Diana*, but in his *Cancionero*:

Ven muerte tan escondida,
que no te sienta venir,
porque el plazer de morir,
no me torne a dar la vida.⁴

¹ *Letters*, 1651, p. 299. Gosse, *Life and Letters* (1899), II, 15, cited the passage as proof of Donne's fondness for Montemayor, but made no attempt to locate the passage alluded to.

² "A Note on Donne's Early Reading," *MLN*, XLIII (1928), 318-319. The translation is Terrill's.

³ *Diana* (1598), p. 14.

⁴ *El Cancionero del poeta George de Montemayor*, Sociedad de bibliófilos

Come, death, ere step or sound I hear,
 Unknown the hour, unfelt the pain;
 Lest the wild joy to feel thee near,
 Should thrill me back to life again.

This well-known quatrain does fit the Donne conceit. It is not, however, Montemayor's (as Donne presumably thought), but the first four lines of El Comendador Escrivá's "Canción," printed in the *Cancionero general de Hernando del Castillo*,⁵ upon which Montemayor wrote a *glosa*. The last five lines of the *glosa* may have stuck, beside the quatrain, in Donne's mind as he wrote the letter—or may indeed have prompted the allusion:

pues, muerte, a quien ofrecida
 tengo esta vida cansada
 ven a mí tan escondida,
 que el plazer de tu llegada,
 no me torne a dar la vida ⁶

The University of Illinois

ERNST G. MATHEWS

DONNE AND THE BEZOAR

That John Donne knew something about the philosophies of the several medical systems of his day is obvious to most readers. His knowledge of medicine, like his knowledge of astronomy, optics, and psychology, is general but up-to-date. In the seventh meditation of the *Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions*, Donne compares his lot in sickness with others less fortunate than he, to these

españoles (Madrid, 1932), p. 396. The translation, by Churton Collins, is cited by James Fitzmaurice-Kelly, *History of Spanish Literature* (1926), p. 133.

⁵ Ed. La sociedad de bibliófilos españoles (Madrid, 1882), I, 517, no. 392. The quatrain was as well known as a nursery rhyme. St. Teresa delighted in it, Cervantes cited it in *Don Quixote* (II, 38); Lope de Vega wrote a *glosa* on it, *Rimas sacras* (1614); Calderón used it in two plays, *El mayor monstruo los celos* (III, XI), and *Las manos blancas no ofenden* (II, III). All agree with Montemayor in their reading of lines 2 and 3 (the *Cancionero general* reads "que no te sienta conmigo / porqu'el gozo de contigo"). Between them Fitzmaurice-Kelly (*loc cit.*) and Julio Cejador y Frauca (*Historia de la lengua y literatura castellana* (Madrid, 1915), I, 447) mentioned all these, but apparently neither scholar knew Montemayor's *glosa*.

⁶ Montemayor, *Cancionero*, p. 397.

miserable ones, he says, "the refuse of our servants (would be) bezoar enough."¹ The *NED* describes "bezoar" as an antidote against poison, and one knows that among the superstitious of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance this queer calcification was employed as a magical remedy against venoms.² Donne's allusion suggests, however, a wider meaning, and Professors Coffin and Witherspoon sense this when they write: "Here some rare and expensive drug is meant which may have been a sort of laxative."³

The problem of Donne's meaning is solved by turning to two of the most authoritative lapidaries of his day Andreas Bassius' *De Gemmis et Lapidibus Pretiosis, eorumque viribus et usu tractatus*, which appeared in Italian in 1581 or 1587 and in Latin with the above title in 1603, and the *Gemmarum et Lapidum Historia* of Anselmus Boetius de Boot, physician of Rudolph II, which was printed in 1609. De Boot's book attempts to be scientific, and the second edition of Baccius' book, which contains a learned commentary by Wolfgang Gabelchover, is a vast improvement over the magical disquisitions of this type that plagued the minds of mediaeval and renaissance men.

Bassius gives twenty pages of his book to an account of the curative qualities of the bezoar and of his experiments with it.⁴ De Boot also discusses the bezoar at length.⁵ He recognized it as a cure for infections, palpitation of the heart, melancholia, quartane, epilepsy, worms, and a large number of other diseases. "Breviter lapis Bezoar ad omnes diuturnos, & importunos morbos etiam qui a statu originem ducunt, Panaceae instar est, si praevia purgatione, per aliquot dies mane exhibeatur."⁶ The bezoar is, one sees in this

¹ *Op. cit.* (Cambridge, 1923), p. 37.

² Nashe writes in *The Prayse of the Red Herring* "did not this counter-poyson of the spitting sicknesse (sixtiefolde more restorative then *Bezer*) patch them out and preserve them." (Ed McKerrow, III, 184) See Sir Thomas Browne, *Pseudodoxia Epidemica*, II, 5 (*Works*, ed Keynes, II, 158) for the physician's point of view or F C Jadertinus, *De Modo Collegendi Pronosticandi et Curandi Febres* (Venice, 1528), p. 20v, and Garcia da Orta, *Colloques on the Simples and Drugs of India* (trans Markham, London, 1913), pp. 363-364.

³ *A Book of Seventeenth-Century Prose* (New York, 1929), p. 63.

⁴ *Op. cit.* (Frankfort, 1603), pp. 179-196.

⁵ *Op. cit.* (Leyden, 1636), pp. 361-370.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 370.

later definition, not a remedy against poison nor a specific but a panacea. This notion is sustained by Baccius.

Unde postea tanti aestimatus fuit Bezoar, ut omnem medicinam, morborum malignorum saevitiam frangentem, per excellentiam, Bezoartica nuncupaverint, hoc nomine in hunc usque diem durante, eo, quod hominem a morte praeservet et liberet.⁷

Donne probably had these contemporary definitions in mind.

Duke University

DON CAMERON ALLEN

NAHUM TATE, LAUREATE: TWO BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

Close students of the lives of the poets laureate should find the following information about Nahum Tate of some interest and importance. It is now, as far as I know, presented publicly for the first time

1. In his own preface to the second edition of his poem about tea,¹ Tate is replying to those critics who have censured him for electing to compose a poem upon a subject as trivial as the tea plant. The subject, he maintains, is not trivial "For I must honestly acknowledge, 'tis to This (despicable) Tea-Leaf that I owe Recovery out of a weakly Constitution from the very Cradle. . . ." Attention is thus drawn to the fact that Tate was not of a robust constitution, and here lies, perhaps, the key to the understanding of the pessimism, discouragement, and general lassitude by which the great bulk of all his work is strongly marked. It is difficult to be optimistic and mentally animated and alert when the body is frail.

11. That Tate's great patron was Charles, Earl of Dorset, is generally known, that he acknowledges assistance from Bucking-

⁷ *Op cit.*, p 179 See also Nicolas Monardes, *Simplicium Medicamentorum ex novo orbe delatorum quorum in medicina usus est historia* (Antwerp, 1593), pp 394-402, 447-454, or in the English version, *Joyful News Out of the Newfound World* (Frampton, 1580), pp 120v-132. In Guido Pancirolli's *Res Memorabiles sive Deperditae*, one of the first documents in the war between the ancients and the moderns, the bezoar is praised in a special chapter as a modern wonder "Latini & Graeci preciosum hunc lapidem nunquam norunt"

¹ "A Poem upon Tea" (London, printed for J. Nutt, 1702).

ham has also been noted. What has been overlooked, however, is that Tate had another patron in the Earl of Carlisle. The evidence is as follows. In the *Majestas Imperii Britannici*, a small collection of Latin poems by Lewis Maidwell paraphrased in English by Nahum in the year 1706, there is a dedication addressed to Charles, Earl of Carlisle. It includes these words: "I took to be a Debt of Duty, having had the Favor of being Many Years under the Patronage of the Lord *Carlisle* . . . Your Lordship's Ever Honor'd Father." (P. [3].) The Charles referred to was Charles Howard, third Earl of Carlisle, who was born in 1674. He was the son of Edward, second Earl of Carlisle (d. 1692), who must have been the patron to whom Tate refers. Edward succeeded to the title on the death of his father, Charles, the first Earl, in 1685. It is clear, therefore, that for some years between 1685 and 1692, by his own statement, Tate enjoyed the favour of the second Earl. Dorset was dead in 1706, and the dedication of the paraphrases of Maidwell to Charles probably represents one of Tate's anxious efforts to secure a new patron. The ominous silence which follows makes it clear that this sanguine expectation never was realized.

Acadia University

H. F. SCOTT-THOMAS

THE AUTHORSHIP OF A *GENERAL VIEW* OF THE STAGE

A General View of the Stage was published in London and Dublin in 1759.¹ We are informed on the title page that Mr. Wilkes is the author, and the dedication to Lord Mornington is signed Thomas Wilkes; but bibliographical authorities relying on statements made by biographical dictionaries have consistently proclaimed that Wilkes was a pen name used by Samuel Derrick. This problem of the authorship of the work has never been completely solved.

Derrick was Boswell's little Irish friend and his "first tutor in the ways of London." The Irishman edited an edition of Dryden's poems which contained extensive critical notes, and he was the author of a considerable amount of hack work; but his authorship

¹ London, J. Coote, Dublin, W. Whetstone.

of *A General View of the Stage* has been denied by William J. Lawrence, the authority on the Irish drama. In a letter to *Notes and Queries* for May 11, 1912, Lawrence pointed out that he had found the following obituary notice in the *Dublin Evening Post* for June 15, 1786

Tuesday evening at his lodgings in Michael's Lane, Mr Thomas Wilkes, author of *A General View of the Stage*, and Editor of Swift's Letters etc. etc. educated in the University of Oxford.²

Lawrence also indicated that one Thomas Wilkes was a Dublin correspondent of David Garrick.³ These discoveries convinced Lawrence that the work was by Thomas Wilkes of Dublin.

Derrick continues to be credited with the authorship of the work by many writers on the eighteenth century drama, but I have found further evidence corroborating Wilks's authorship. A few years ago I discovered that a collection of manuscript letters by Derrick and his friends was in the Forster Collection at the Victoria and Albert Museum in London, among them several of George Faulkner, the well known Dublin publisher. In April, 1759, Faulkner wrote from Dublin to Derrick, who was then living in England.

I suppose you hear often from Wilks, who can give you a much better account of theatrical affairs than I can possibly do, as he is active, and I an invalid and a cripple

On December 18, 1759, Faulkner again writes from Dublin:

Both your pleasing letters of the 1st and 7th instant and that for Mr. Wilks came by yesterday's mail. That gentleman hath got much reputation by his writings on the stage

In a further letter Faulkner described Wilks as "the greatest theatrical critic" that he knew. The following statement occurs in the preface to Derrick's *Poetical Dictionary*:

Mr Wilks of Dublin, who sometime since published an entertaining view of the stage, furnished us with some materials from his elegant collection of poets, for which it is necessary here to thank him.⁴

² A photostat of this notice has been examined and found to be identical with that quoted by Mr Lawrence

³ See *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick with the most Celebrated Persons of his Time*, ed James Boaden (London, 1833), I, 530-1

⁴ *A Poetical Dictionary: or, The Beauties of the English Poets, Alphabetically Displayed* (London, 1761), p xi. Internal evidence and a MS.

Although the preface is unsigned, other passages indicate clearly that it is written by the editor.

Tate Wilkinson, the actor, relates that when he visited Ireland, in 1759, Garrick gave him a letter to "a Mr. Wilks who had just then finished a history of the Irish stage, and had paid Mr. Garrick most lavish compliments"⁵ *A General View of the Stage* contains a chapter devoted to Garrick's "different excellencies," and two on the Irish theatre

A comparison of *A General View of the Stage* with Derrick's *Remarks Upon the Tragedy of Venice Preserved*, which appeared as the first number of the *Dramatic Censor* in 1752, has revealed that a few passages from the latter have been quoted almost verbatim in *A General View of the Stage*. Notices of the book appeared in several London papers at the time of publication. The *London Chronicle*⁶ and the *Gentleman's Magazine*⁷ state that it is by "Mr. Wilkes of Dublin." The *Critical Review* remarks "This book was written by a private gentleman (who resides at Dublin) for his amusement."⁸

The author states in the preface to *A General View of the Stage* that he does not offer the work as a finished performance. "He is convinced," he says, "that first attempts seldom reach perfection. . . ." Such a remark could not have been made by Derrick, who had already published several works in 1759.

Since Mr. Wilks of Dublin was an authority on the drama, wrote a history of the stage in 1759, and was a friend of Derrick who himself acknowledged that Wilks wrote "a view of the stage," there can be no doubt that this gentleman was Thomas Wilkes and that he was the author of *A General View of the Stage*. It is also clear that Wilkes borrowed freely from Derrick's account of Otway's *Venice Preserved*.

WILLIAM HUBERT MILLER

New York City

letter from George Faulkner in the Victoria and Albert Museum indicate that Derrick was the editor of this anthology

⁵ *Memours of His On Life* (York, 1790), II, 151. I am indebted to the late Mr. Lawrence for pointing this out to me

⁶ V (1759), 254

⁷ XXXIX (1759), 134.

⁸ VII (1759), 447.

"A PARADISE WITHIN THEE" IN MILTON, BYRON,
AND SHELLEY

The parting words of Michael in *Paradise Lost* are serve God in deeds as well as words, practice the Christian virtues, and you will "possess a paradise within thee."¹ Lucifer, in Byron's *Cain*, holds out too the promise of an internal world which Cain is to build for himself by taking heed of the lesson he has learned.

Think and endure, and form an inner world
In your own bosom—where the outward fails,
So shall you nearer be the spiritual
Nature, and war triumphant with your own

(*Cain*, II, 11, 463-6)

But the lesson which Cain has learned from his journeyings through "myriads of starry worlds"² in "the abyss of space"³ is precisely the opposite of that which Adam has learned from his vision of the history of mankind, a vision which is carefully confined to "this transient world" and which stops short of the "abyss, Eternity, whose end no eye can reach"⁴ Adam has learned that it is best to love and obey God, to be constantly aware of Him and His providence, "Merciful over all his works, with good Still overcoming evil," and that "suffering for Truth's sake Is fortitude to highest victory, And to the faithful Death the Gate of Life."⁵ Cain, however, does not depart "in peace of thought" and with "fill of knowledge."⁶ He finds the gifts of God few, "and some of those but bitter," and, though his mind can scarcely bring together what he has seen "into calm and clear thought," he aspires to behold the "great double Mysteries,"⁷ the dwellings of Jehovah and Lucifer, even if he perish for it. Michael replies to Adam: "This having learnt, thou hast attain'd the sum Of wisdom";⁸ but Lucifer, answering Cain's "Alas! I seem nothing," tells him that "the human sum of knowledge" is "to know mortal nature's nothingness"⁹ Man does not serve any purpose in the divine scheme of things. In fact there is no divine scheme of things. God, a tyrant lonely in his vast empire,

¹ *II*, 574-82.

² *Cain*, II, 11, 361

³ *Ibid*, Stage direction for II, 1.

⁴ *P. L.*, XII, 554-6

⁵ *Ibid.*, XII, 561-71.

⁶ *Ibid*, 558-9

⁷ *Cain*, II, 11, 448, 402-3, 405.

⁸ *P. L.*, XII, 575-6.

⁹ *Cain*, II, 11, 420-2.

so wretched in his height,
 So restless in his wretchedness, must still
 Create, and re-create, (*Cain*, I, 1, 161-3)

multiplying Himself in misery. In this world of misery, which is terminated only by death—and death for Cain is not “the Gate of Life” but a fearful, shadowy prospect—to think is to suffer. It is, however, preferable to blind obedience to the “Omnipotent tyrant.”¹⁰ Thinking forces upon man the realization of his insignificance in relation to the universe, but, at the same time, by making him understand the immensity of the universe, it enables him in a sense to master it and to rise above the dust of which he is composed. This is the inner world to be gained by obedience to the injunction “Think and endure.”

One of Shelley's heroes is also informed of a Paradise which lies within him, but the speaker is neither angel nor devil, but a woman. Cythna, the perfect help-mate of Laon, the idealistic fighter for freedom, comforts her lover and companion.

O dearest love! we shall be dead and cold
 Before this morn may on the world arise
 Wouldst thou the glory of its dawn behold?
 Alas! gaze not on me, but turn thine eyes
 On thine own heart—it is a Paradise
 Which everlasting spring has made its own,
 And while drear winter fills the naked skies,
 Sweet streams of sunny thought, and flowers fresh blown,
 Are there, and weave their sounds and odors into one
 In their own hearts the earnest of the hope
 Which made them great the good will ever find,
 And though some envious shade may interlope
 Between the effect and it, One comes behind,
 Who aye the future to the past will bind—
 Necessity. (*Revolt of Islam*, IX, xxvi-xxvii)

The pathos of these lines, which might have been spoken by William Godwin's daughter, is increased when we remember that Shelley at the time of writing this poem feared that he was under the shadow of death.

Rebels living in a time of reaction, Milton, Byron, and Shelley were each faced with the problem of finding within themselves an inner world so that they would not be crushed by the pressure of a

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, I, i, 138.

hostile environment. The inner world of each illumines his character.

Milton is unable to solace himself with the thought that his dream will come true, as Shelley does, Michael, in his last words, foresees not a puissant England, re-invigorated by a newer and greater Reformation, but a world growing more and more evil till the Day of Judgment. Milton had lost his faith in mankind, what he had retained was his faith in the power of the individual man to attain the good. This good is not to be attained by metaphysical speculation, which is identified in Milton's mind with medieval scholasticism and the spirit of skepticism prevalent in the court of Charles II, but through moral discipline and faith in God. Milton's humility in the face of God is accompanied by an exaltation that comes from serving His will, which, together with his consciousness of his great historic rôle, has caused him to be attacked as "arrogant."

In Adam is typified all of mankind. Milton, even in drawing Samson, was able to objectify himself in a way which the self-glorifying Byron and the self-pitying Shelley could not. Can is one of those Byronic heroes who are a mere projection of Byron himself. He is Byron in revolt against his Calvinist upbringing, yet unable finally to escape from a Calvinist sense of sin. Even before he is sent forth an exile, he is isolated from the rest of human society by his spirit of revolt, even his beloved Adah does not understand him. Lucifer merely articulates the thoughts which were already in him, he had already been aware that this is a world of misery and evil and had begun to seek an inner world of proud defiance and stoicism in suffering and consciousness of superiority.

Shelley does not accept the suffering of this world as a necessary part of the only Paradise to which man can attain, but escapes from it to the contemplation of the millenium. His ability to immerse himself in the ideal world which he created in his poetry, his faith in its realization, and his "consciousness of acting from a lofty and heroic sense of right"¹¹ enabled "mad Shelley" to keep fighting against all odds.

PAUL SIEGEL

Cambridge, Massachusetts

¹¹ Mrs Shelley's note to *The Witch of Atlas*.

BYRON'S RETURN FROM GREECE

In *Lord Byron's Correspondence* (1922), John Murray remarked that "there is nothing to indicate the exact date when Byron left Athens on his homeward voyage" from Greece in 1811.¹ But Murray, like even Byron's recent biographers, overlooked the information with which one is able to date the poet's return from his Eastern travels.

One of his acquaintances at Athens whom Byron described as "vastly amiable and accomplished" was young Charles Robert Cockerell, then at the beginning of his distinguished career as artist, archaeologist, and architect.² His journal—*Travels in Southern Europe and the Levant, 1810-1817, The Journal of C. R. Cockerell, R.A., edited by his son Samuel Pepys Cockerell* (1903)—contains a letter which Cockerell sent to England on April 11 by the hand of Byron, who was then leaving Athens.

April 11th—Lord Byron embarked to-day on board the transport (which is carrying Lord Elgin's Marbles) for Malta. He takes this letter with him, and will send it on to you, I trust, immediately on his arrival in England. I must close, as he is just off for the Piræus.³

Byron's ship, the *Hydra* transport, did not sail at once, however, but waited several days, apparently off the Piræus. The Elgin papers relating to the transportation of the Marbles show that the ship finally got under way on April 22 and reached Malta eight days later on the 30th.⁴

Thus, ironically enough, Byron began his homeward voyage from Greece on a ship laden with part of the spoils gathered by agents of Lord Elgin, whom he had vilified in *The Curse of Minerva*, written approximately a month earlier. What is more,

¹ I 31. "There are no letters extant from Byron between 18 March 1811 and 15 May of that year. As the journey from Athens to Malta in those days took about ten days, we may assume that Byron left Athens on or about the 4th May 1811." In *The Works of Lord Byron, Letters and Journals* (1898-1901) Prothero gives no letter between those to Byron's mother from Athens, February 28, and from the *Volage* frigate, at sea, June 25.

² *Ibid.*, p. 29. Cockerell is also mentioned at pp. 22, 23, 24, and 41.

³ *Travels in Southern Europe*, p. 48.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 48 and 50, and A. H. Smith, "Lord Elgin and His Collection," *Journal Hellenic Studies*, xxxvi (1916), 281-82.

when Byron started for England on June 2 or 3, after a few days more than a month in Malta, he carried a letter from Elgin's chief draughtsman, Lusieri, to none other than the "pictish peer" who had desecrated the Parthenon by removing its sculpture.⁵

Waterville, Maine

STEPHEN A LARRABEE

GALSWORTHY'S GENEALOGICAL ERROR

In a novelist with such a pronounced interest in genealogy as John Galsworthy a genealogical error is somewhat remarkable. Yet such an error occurs in all the editions of *The Forsyte Saga* and I do not find any previous mention of it by scholars or critics. In Part I, Chapter V of *To Let*, Galsworthy accounts for the fact that Val Dartie and Holly Forsyte Dartie have no children on the grounds that they had decided that, since they were first cousins, it would be unsafe. Twice in a single paragraph (p. 90) Galsworthy describes them as "first cousins."

But we have only to recall the events of the first novel of the series, *The Man of Property*, to know that this husband and wife were second cousins. A glance at the Forsyte family tree will make this clear. Superior Dosset Forsyte begat James and Old Jolyon; James begat Winifred Forsyte Dartie, who begat Val Dartie, Old Jolyon begat Young Jolyon, who begat Holly. Hence Winifred and Young Jolyon were first cousins, and Val and Holly second cousins.

This error becomes the more remarkable since in the novel which immediately preceded *To Let* in the series, *In Chancery*, Galsworthy has correctly described Val and Holly as second cousins. In Part I, Chapter VII, p. 141 of *In Chancery*, Val introduces himself to Holly as her second cousin, and again in Part II, Chapter I, p. 220, Galsworthy has Jolly Forsyte, the brother of Holly, refer to Val as a second cousin.

HERBERT EDWARDS

Ohio State University

⁵ See Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 282. Lusieri and, presumably too, his brother-in-law, Nicolo Giraud, the young Greek friend of Byron who was given seven thousand pounds in the Newstead will of August 12, 1811, had accompanied Byron (and the Marbles) to Malta.

REVIEWS

- Das Historische Drama in England von der Romantik bis zur Gegenwart.* By ROBERT FRICKER Schweizer Anglistische Arbeiten, Band 8. Bern: A Francke Ag., 1940. Pp. vi + 363.
- Die Entwicklung des sozialen Dramas in England vor Galsworthy.* By HORST FRENZ Bleicherode am Harz: Carl Nieft, 1938. Pp. 69.
- 'Romeo and Juliet' as an Experimental Tragedy.* Annual Lecture of the British Academy, 1939. By H. B. CHARLTON. London: Humphrey Milford, New York: Oxford University Press, [1940]. Pp. 45. \$85.
- Rhetoric in Spenser's Poetry.* By HERBERT DAVID RIX. Pennsylvania State College Studies, No. 7. State College, Pa., 1940. Pp. 88.
- A Study of Spenser's Gentleman.* By JAMES LYNDON SHANLEY. Evanston, Ill., 1940. Pp. viii + 55.
- Marlowe's Imagery and the Marlowe Canon.* By MARION BODWELL SMITH. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1940. Pp. vii + 213.
- Harington & Ariosto: A Study in Elizabethan Verse Translation* By TOWNSEND RICH. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940. Pp. viii + 228. \$2.00.
- Antichrist and The Prophets of Antichrist in the Chester Cycle.* By BROTHER LINUS URBAN LUCKEN, F. S. C. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1940. Pp. x + 158.
- The Poems of Thomas Pestell.* Edited with an account of his life and work by HANNAH BUCHAN. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1940. Pp. lvi + 146. 12/6.
- Some Seventeenth-Century Worthies in a Twentieth-Century Mirror.* By R. BALFOUR DANIELS. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1940. Pp. x + 156. \$2.00.
- Sir Thomas Elyot's 'The Defence of Good Women.'* Edited by EDWIN JOHNSTON HOWARD. Oxford, Ohio: The Anchor Press, 1940. Pp. ix + 85. \$1.25.
- Shakespeare Studies: Julius Caesar.* By BLANCHE COLES. New York: R. R. Smith, 1940. Pp. xii + 281. \$2.50.

By far the weightiest in this group of miscellaneous studies is the Swiss doctoral dissertation, from the University of Basel, by Robert Fricker. *Das Historische Drama in England* (more properly Britain) is a thorough, methodical, and philosophical examination of the historical play from the late eighteenth century to Yeats and Eliot, so thorough that scarcely a play can have been overlooked. The treatment is analytical, within the general framework of chronology, by types and motifs rather than by authors. Herr Fricker has plotted his course through a great mass of plays with a sure hand and with an eye constantly on the tempers of the successive periods, with the result that his study is unexpectedly rich and informative. To give an adequate summary of his book would be to exceed the space at my disposal. I must be content to recommend it as an indispensable aid to the student of British drama since 1800.

Dr. Horst Frenz's dissertation is a much slighter affair, the method of which is to take samples of the social drama from Holcroft on, comparing them whenever possible with treatments of similar themes by Galsworthy, who is taken as the goal or pattern of a serious, realistic, humanitarian sociological dramaturgy. Dr. Frenz's purpose is to show how the drama of the nineteenth century struggled, often ineptly but with increasing knowledge and without foreign help, to find this pattern. The resulting exposition is hardly more than a sketch, but it is a sketch in which the lines are rightly drawn.

Professor Charlton's British Academy lecture is an example of critical ego feeding itself on Shakespeare, such as this scholar has provided before now and such as characterizes a good deal of contemporary British Shakespeare criticism. His thesis in brief is this. In choosing a domestic subject for his tragedy Shakespeare made "aesthetically well-nigh an anarchist's gesture" (but what about *Arden of Feversham*?), having chosen to write of the innocent loves of two young citizens, he was thrown back on the feud and on fate as the motivating forces in the inherited story; but he virtually destroyed the feud as an active force, and his choice of fate was unlucky because fate could no longer be taken seriously as "a deity strong enough to carry the responsibility of tragic necessity." Hence the tragedy is essentially a failure, although saved in a measure by its delightful accessories. Here is an argument which is based more on what Professor Charlton thinks Shakespeare ought to have done than on what he really did. To consider the feud, it is true that throughout the first two acts Shakespeare weakens the feud almost to vanishing; but he does so deliberately and not inadvertently, so that by a compelling and perfectly natural chain of circumstances, culminating in the remarkable first scene of Act III, he can revive that dying monster for one last annihilating blow. Tragic peripety and tragic irony, in their most unforeseen

and unavoidable form, are nowhere better exemplified in Shakespeare. The first two acts are almost pure comedy, in itself a sufficient reason for those ominous warnings which must necessarily take the form of fatal premonitions. It is true that the tragic scheme of this play is unique in Shakespeare, that he has used not fate, not an opposing malevolence, not a flaw in character as the destructive element, but natural human circumstance, embodied mostly in the spontaneous passions of Romeo, Tybalt, Mercutio, and Capulet. Fate has really no part in this play, ill-luck and all-too-human impulsiveness have. Call the play experimental if you will, call it indeed if you must an inferior tragic pattern, but do not call it a failure except in the eye of a narrow critical dogmatism.

Of the two Spenser monographs Professor Rix's is the more substantial. Composed in large part of illustration of Spenser's use of the many formal schemes recommended by Renaissance rhetoricians, it has a thesis of some importance, namely, that the principles of rhetorical adornment were indispensable to the poet in planning the architecture and in choosing the details of his poems. They were the tools of a sound, systematic craftsmanship. Dr. Shanley, from the *Faerie Queene*, builds up Spenser's concept of the ideal gentleman, which turns out to agree in the main with ideas accepted in his time but has some variations, notably in emphasizing the worth of military prowess. The scholarship is of a superficial, descriptive kind, which involves little more than a careful reading of Spenser and a knowledge of modern authorities on Renaissance gentility.

Dr. Smith applies to Marlowe the technique of imagery-analysis perfected by Miss Spurgeon, gathering the images under the heads of learning, body, domestic life, daily life, nature, animals, and arts. He believes that he is able to establish predilections among these classes which are consistent enough to be used as guides, or at least checks, to the discovery of Marlowe's presence or absence in many places. The second half of his dissertation applies his conclusions to some fourteen plays in which Marlowe's hand has been suspected, with results which are interesting but which cannot be detailed here. It will serve as a sample to say that Marlowe's participation is granted in *Arden of Feversham*, I and III *Henry VI*, and *A Larum for London*, and denied in *Richard III* (although the influence of his style of imagery is admitted), *Julius Caesar*, *Taming of A Shrew*, *Lust's Dominion*, *Selimus*, and *Troublesome Reign of King John*. Dr. Smith is careful not to claim more than contributory validity for his kind of evidence; but as a matter of fact it has a stronger authority than most of the other internal evidences, in cases where there is a sufficiency of text. The printing is rather careless; errors exist on pp. 4, 12, 198, 199, and 201.

Dr. Rich makes *Orlando* the center for a study of Harington's life and character. There is a good deal which will be useful to

scholars, particularly to those who want to know something about the poem without the labor of reading it. Dr Rich discusses among other things the principal Italian editions, Harington's treatment of the text, his additions to the text, and his highly personal notes. But unfortunately Harington's wit has struck no answering spark. Dr. Rich plods conscientiously after the skipping epigrammatist, who deserves a brilliant essay and perhaps some day will get it.

Brother Lucken's careful and cautious study of the Antichrist legend is unable to find a definite source for the two plays on *Antichrist* and *The Prophets of Antichrist* in the Chester cycle. The most that he is willing to say is that the *Antichrist* is in the tradition of the monk Adso and that the *Prophets* (a unique play) is probably an imitation of the *Processus Prophetarum*, suggested by the parallelism between Christ and Antichrist. For the Fifteen Signs of Doom appended to the *Prophets*, he finds a close parallel in John Mirk's *Festial*, which he believes to be the source. But Mirk's sermon was composed seventy or more years after the date commonly assigned to the cycle. Therefore the Signs of Doom may be a later addition, a theory to which Brother Lucken inclines because there is no organic connection between the *Prophets* and the Signs.

Miss Buchan has done well by Thomas Pestell, a very minor clergyman-poet of the seventeenth century, providing a text with full apparatus of notes and a biographical introduction. Pestell's life, particularly the part during the Commonwealth, was a tragedy which is more likely to interest the modern reader than his poetry. Yet his verse, unimportant for the most part, has at times a saving grace that makes it worth keeping.

Professor Daniels' essays are brief ruminations on a variety of seventeenth century matters, chosen according to no plan but his own liking, prying occasionally into obscure corners but mostly touching on the familiar. They are sound and informative rather than adventurous and provocative, which is but cool praise for the informal literary essay.

The *Defence of Good Women* is a facsimile reprint, beautifully executed, of the first edition, edited by Professor Howard with a brief introduction and notes on the textual variations of the second edition.

Miss Coles' *Julius Caesar*, presumably like her companion studies of *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*, represents the new pedagogy of Shakespeare which relieves the student of every incentive to effort by telling him the historical background, what the dialogue means, what happens, and what the critics have said about this, that, and the other. Nothing is left for the student to do except plough through her book, he doesn't even need to read the play.

The Variants in the First Quarto of 'King Lear,' A Bibliographical and Critical Inquiry By WALTER WILSON GREG Supplement to the Bibliographical Society's Transactions, no. 15. London. Oxford University Press, 1940. Pp. viii + 192.

Scholars already owe a great debt to Dr. Greg for his basic work on so many problems of Elizabethan drama and literature. The present monograph is no exception to his long record of painstaking care in the assembling and analysis of evidence. It is not too much to say that no scholarly text of *King Lear* could be edited without the data presented in this study and that, perhaps, no one but Dr. Greg could have carried out the research successfully.

It is well known that copies of Q1 differ in that certain sheets are found in two states, corrected and uncorrected. In Chapter II of Part One, Dr. Greg describes the twelve extant copies which he has examined, and provides a table indicating the particular corrected and uncorrected sheets in each copy. In Chapter III, he sets down in parallel fashion the fifty material variants which his exhaustive comparison has produced: the uncorrected passage, a notation of the corrections in the corrected forme, and the passage as it stands in the Folio. Dr. Greg's theory as to how the sheets in Q1 happen to have only one forme corrected, never both—with one small but significant exception—is next set forth in Chapter III. Appendix I provides us with a list of errors in the Praetorius facsimile; Appendix II, with misprints in the original; and Appendix III, with doubtful readings in the original. Part II of the monograph shows Dr. Greg at his best in discussing the variant passages given in Chapter III of Part One. "The ultimate question in each individual case," he writes, "is, of course, whether the reading as determined by the corrector agrees or not with the intention of the author." F must have been printed from a copy of Q1 which had been amended by reference to a MS. Greg determines as well as can be done what formes were corrected and what formes were not in this copy of Q1. He then deals with each of the fifty passages to determine what the correct reading should be. It is here that the author employs all the resources of a trained bibliographer, textual critic, lexicographer, student of literature, savant rolled into one. Dr. Greg concludes:

There is no disguising the fact that editors have left the textual criticism of *King Lear* in a thoroughly unsatisfactory state, indeed one is almost tempted to say that no work worth mentioning has hitherto been done on the subject. This is hardly surprising seeing that the necessary apparatus was not available. I believe that now the whole of the information needed is at the disposal of the editors, and it appears to be high time that they set about the job of preparing a text of the play that shall be based upon a properly reasoned estimate of the evidence.

The present *textus receptus*, as Dr. Greg suggests, is unsatisfactory. Wright and Clark, apparently considering the author-

ity of Qq and F of equal strength, constructed an eclectic text. Judging among the variants by taste alone, they took a word from Q1, a word from Q2, a word from F and called the resultant line Shakespeare's. It would seem that we, today, with the great store of bibliographical and textual knowledge acquired since the time of the Cambridge Edition could do better. Unfortunately, what this knowledge does in the case of *King Lear* is to indicate strongly how very difficult the problem of this text really is. Not even the writer of *The Variants in the First Quarto of 'King Lear'*—which because of its thoroughness and lucidity must be indispensable to any future editor of the play—not even Dr. Greg seems to realize the exasperating nature of the total problem. Full description entails some repetition of what has been written above.

Extant copies of Q1 differ in that certain formes are to be found in both a corrected and an uncorrected state. The copy for F was, apparently, a Q1 amended by reference to a MS., this particular Q1 consisting like the other copies which have come down to us of some sheets corrected and some sheets not (Miss Doran, one may add, because of similarities of punctuation and spelling, seems to think that the compositor of F at times followed Q2!) Dr. Greg points out that when F and Q1 agree, there is less warrant for the reading than when F's reading differs from Q1's. But even this assumption is based on the hidden assumption that F is a text superior to Q1. Let us, however, for the moment assume with Greg and Chambers that Q1 is a shorthand report of an actual performance. If Q1 is a bad quarto, then F's is the sole text of any clear authority. Since F was based on Q1, however, there is always the possibility that the F editor was careless in his correcting of Q to conform to the MS before him and retained Q1 when he should have changed it. Or the MS was so difficult to decipher that he had, perforce, to allow the Quarto's reading to stand. Furthermore, even if F is based on a corrected sheet of Q1, it does not necessarily follow that the reading of the uncorrected sheet is without warrant, for the correction may be a guess on the part of the Q1 proofreader—and we may find ourselves with Greg speculating on the reading in the MS. which the Q1 compositor had before him!

The problem, of course, is to get Shakespeare's text. Is F superior? What if an editor follows Miss Doran's view and holds that Q1 represents a revision of the version upon which F is based? What if an editor holds with Van Dam that Q1 is "far superior to the F version," that Q1 "belongs to the class of printed plays nearest to Shakespeare's originals," and that F is but a revision of the prompt-book?

The present reviewer doesn't for a moment consider either Miss Doran's or Van Dam's views on the relationship of the texts substantiated. But even if Q1 be a debased text, in what way is it debased, where is it debased? An editor can't merely shrug his

shoulders and say that Q1 is correct, that anyone can see that it is! Even though textual criticism be an art rather than a science and even though taste be constantly a criterion, still one does try to get as much objective evidence for a reading as one can. One *tries* to get out of the dark of simple personal judgment. In the matter of the *King Lear* F-Q1 relationship, there is one way and only one way of establishing some sort of tangible locus, and that is to see whether Q1 bears the same relationship to F as the other bad quartos do to their good texts. No one seriously holds now that Q1 of *Hamlet* is anything but a corruption of the true text given in Q2. To say that Q1 of *King Lear* is a shorthand report is not to advance the inquiry. If Q1 of *King Lear* stands in the same relationship to F as the bad quarto, say, of *Henry V* stands to the F version, then F text of *King Lear* must represent the anterior text. The better—so to speak—the bad quarto of a particular play is, the harder it is to convince scholars that the good text is closer to Shakespeare and earlier. In 1929 Peter Alexander, after showing that *The Contention* and *The True Tragedie* are memorial perversions of *II* and *III Henry VI* as given in the Folio, went to great length to show that Q of *Richard III* did not stand in the same relation to the F text. He argued, in short, that Q of *Richard III* was a good quarto. Yet eight years later, in 1936, David Lyall Patrick showed clearly in *The Textual History of Richard III* that the quarto contained constant examples of memorial confusion! This reviewer suggests that a bold scholar, working along the lines of Greg in his classic study of *Orlando Furioso* in *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements*, should be able to show that the text of Q1 of *King Lear* is nothing but a corruption of the text in the F. When this task has been done thoroughly, when the primal authority of F has been established by means of this comparison, then the editing of *King Lear* can begin in earnest.

St. Louis University

LEO KIRSCHBAUM

Donne's Imagery: A Study in Creative Sources. By MILTON ALLAN RUGOFF. New York: Corporate Press, 1939. Pp. 270. \$2.50.

Mr. Rugoff has performed a service to the students of Donne: quantitatively, by measuring the fields of his imagery, qualitatively, by assessing their significance. In the qualitative aspect, however, his service will be variously received. He confirms, by detailed evidence though ambiguous interpretation, the modern view of the operation of Donne's poetic method, he compares, by the aid of Professor Spurgeon's analyses, the fields of imagery employed by Donne with those employed by other Elizabethans. His fundamental premise is that imagery betrays personality, or that the

choice of imagery, being relatively free, reveals "interest." But in general this premise is not allowed to force conclusions, since other considerations appear at times to offset it, especially when the showing is negative. For instance, although Donne was interested in law, legal imagery is not very prominent in his work; hence he must have felt that legal imagery had been overworked. To this inference some readers might oppose the proposition that legal casuistry appears in the dialectical mode of his work.

Occasionally Mr. Rugoff himself denies any necessary connection in imagery between "use" and "interest", he does so by emphasizing in Donne a tendency toward the precise, abstruse, or bizarre which influences his use of any particular field. We may ask whether Donne's "proclivity toward the mechanical" betrays an "interest" or an exigence of expression. Does he choose a technical image because it is technical or because it provides the means for nice discrimination? If the functions rather than the appearances of things occupy Donne, are we to conclude that his use of functional or interpretive metaphor is a consequence of his interest in mechanics? When we are told that the number of images which issue from the direct experience of the senses is negligible in Donne (p. 227), we want to know why Donne was ever called sensual, or why any stomachs were ever queasy over the "Elegies." Mr. Rugoff, in fact, is so preoccupied with the intellectual aspects of Donne's imagery that we are likely to get the impression not only that his imagery is defecated of all substance, but that his abstractions are not highly energized shadows.

In regarding imagery in its substance as "most revelatory" of the creative imagination (p. 14), Mr. Rugoff has Coleridge against him "Imagery,—(even taken from nature, much more when transplanted from books, as travels, voyages, and works of natural history) . . . may . . . be acquired as a trade"; it is not a gift of imagination (*Biographia*, Ch. xv). Even if we agree with Mr. Rugoff, we cannot be sure that in delimiting "creative sources" he has been able to distinguish between imagery taken from nature and imagery taken from books; for instance, from the Bible. Again, if we recall "The Song of Solomon," Donne's fusion of the erotic and the religious may seem less open to personal inference. Even in his day these two regions of strong feeling had long been as ready to exchange their imagery as their paradox. Furthermore, to ascribe intellectual sympathy to one set of images rather than another, in astronomy for example, may seem hazardous to some readers. T. S. Eliot, incidentally, found that "Donne merely picked up, like a magpie, various shining fragments of ideas as they struck his eye, and stuck them about here and there in his verse." While Sir Thomas Browne held poets responsible for promoting error through their similitudes, he did not accuse them of believing in the sources of their own similes.

In conclusion Mr. Rugoff has sought to distinguish Donne's originality by comparing his fields of imagery with those of his contemporaries, as analyzed by Professor Spurgeon. On the use of figures John Hoskins—no rubberstamp contemporary of Donne—remarked that he had used and outworn six several styles since he was first Fellow of New College; he even particularized as follows: "whilst mathematics were in request, all our similitudes came from lines, circles, and angles, whilst moral philosophy is now a while spoken of, it is rudeness not to be sententious" (*Directions for Speech and Style*, p. 39). These words, written at the end of the sixteenth century, may be set against Mr. Rugoff's remark (p. 72), apropos of mathematics, "that as a source of imagery this entire branch of learning, so fertile for Donne was virtually barren for his contemporaries." Although predisposed to such remarks, Mr. Rugoff is not unaware that Donne's originality is not dependent upon the truth of such statements: he does comment on Donne's "use" of various sources of imagery.

Together with interesting observations, this book provides detailed evidence by which to evaluate the modern description of Donne's style. Mr. Rugoff has performed his task with energy and enthusiasm, and has translated rather intractable material into a readable account.

GEORGE WILLIAMSON

The University of Chicago

Musae Anglicanae: A History of Anglo-Latin Poetry, 1500-1925.

By LEICESTER BRADNER. Modern Language Association of America, General Series, no. X. New York: Modern Language Association of America; London: Oxford University Press, 1940. Pp. xii + 384. \$3.50.

Oratio in Laudem Artis Poeticae. By JOHN RAINOLDS. With an introduction and commentary by WILLIAM RINGLER and an English translation by WALTER ALLEN, JR. Princeton Studies in English, no. 20. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940. Pp. viii + 96. \$1.50.

Nobilis or a View of the Life and Death of a Sidney and Lessus Lugubris. By THOMAS MOFFET. With introduction, translation and notes by VIRGIL B. HELTZEL and HOYT H. HUDSON. San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1940. Pp. xxiv + 146. \$3.75.

All of these studies are documents in the history of Anglo-Latin literature and should prove to the students of the vernacular the importance of examining this department of our national

culture. With many carefully chosen illustrations, Professor Bradner shows how this tradition continued through four centuries, and the other two books provide references for the yet unwritten history of Anglo-Latin prose. One will not go to Ramold's oration for new data on Renaissance theories of criticism; and though the newly discovered biography of Sidney supplies a few new colors to that already over-decorated idol, the philopophils will find that it is essentially another ecstatic panegyric. The importance of the two editions resides in what they tell one about Anglo-Latin prose, that subtle blending of classical and patristic Latin, of Augustus and Augustine. For those who do not read Latin, the editors of both texts have made excellent translations which recapture, as well as translations can, the nuances and tone of the originals. As one reads the Latin or the English of these texts, one should think of Donne, Hall, Taylor, Fuller, Henry More, Felltham, Stillingfleet, and other seventeenth century prose masters. There are some obvious analogies.

Professor Bradner's book is of the greatest importance. It is the first history of Anglo-Latin poetry to be printed; it is the child of a long and honest affection; and it is crammed with fire-new information, a condition most rare in an age given to rewriting old books. One does not propose to discuss this book from the standpoint of a student of Anglo-Latin letters; the professors of Latin should be allowed to discover that it is as good a book as Ellinger's and infinitely better than Mann's. Since this work is a sort of 1776 for those students who have insisted that a knowledge of neo-Latin writers is necessary for a better knowledge of vernacular men of letters, one should mention a few of the things that a student of English literature can gain from this book.

The student of English literature whose Latin has gotten rusty or whose Latin never existed should not read Bradner's book from cover to cover; he should read those chapters which include the period of his special interest for in them he will find much to inform and enlighten. He will obtain the expert opinion of Professor Bradner on the Latin poetry of Jortin, Hobbes, Gray, Johnson, and other writers who performed in two rings. The student of English literature will also discover that the Anglo-Latin poets often set the vogue for the vernacular poets. The eclogue, the city poem, the river panegyric, and other verse fashions were first perfected by the neo-Latins; the Elizabethan historical poem drew its strength from the earlier historical verse of the Latin poets. The forms of vernacular poetry were also affected by the verse of the later Latins. Those students of English literature who have been struck by the metrical irregularities of seventeenth century poetry should read Bradner's brilliant exposition of the use of the irregular line by the Latin poets of the same age. In a similar fashion, specialists in the eighteenth century will find that the partiality of the Anglo-Latin poets of that age for the Horatian ode is signifi-

cant. Finally, the student of the vernacular will discover in this book the importance of studying the neo-Latins for sheer questions of fact. Bradner points out, for example, that a poem of Thomas Diant corrects the *DNB* dates of Hartwell by thirteen years; his discussion of the pseudo-Spenserian *Epithalamium Thamesis* is equally interesting.

Space does not permit a fuller discussion of this valuable work of reference which, one is sure, will be the standard study on this subject for many years. From the standpoint of the non-Latinist, it has, however, a fault, no attempt has been made to translate the numerous illustrative verses which fill its pages. One suspects that this omission was a matter of economics rather than desire. In time Professor Bradner may give us a selected group of translations, a *flores elegantiarum*, to accompany this solid study.

DON CAMERON ALLEN

Duke University

English Song-Books, 1651-1702. A Bibliography, with a First-line Index of Songs. By CYRUS LAWRENCE DAY and ELEANORE BOSWELL MURRIE. London: Oxford University Press, 1940 (for 1937). Pp. xxii + 440. Printed for the Bibliographical Society and issued only to Members.

This volume takes worthy place in the series of the Bibliographical Society's publications. It will be welcomed alike by musicologists and students of English literature. Mr. Day and Mrs. Murrie give minute bibliographical descriptions in chronological order of all editions and issues of English and Scotch secular song-books from 1651 through 1702, one of the great periods of English music. For the convenience of scholars, they locate copies in twenty-two principal collections in the British Isles and America. In addition, they present a vast body of complex information—never before available—in eight different indexes of "First Lines," "Composers," "Authors," "Singers and Actors," "Tunes and Airs," "Sources," "Song-Books" (i. e. titles of song-books), and "Printers, Publishers, and Booksellers." Blessed with so much, I may seem ungrateful to ask for more, but I regret that space could not be found for two other indexes: (1) of the patrons of music to whom the song-books were dedicated; and (2) of the authors of commendatory poems. Such verses are very difficult to trace, particularly when they occur in volumes as rare as those listed in the *Bibliography*, and specialists would, I am sure, welcome information about the commendatory poems contributed to these song-books by Waller, Lovelace, Shadwell, Katharine Phillips, and two or three score others.

A careful examination of over fifty of the song-books indicates that the bibliographical descriptions are accurate and the indexes reliable. Since the compilation of the *Bibliography*, a number of items have been acquired or identified by the Folger Library, so that, in addition to those already recorded, it should be noted that the Folger possesses copies of Nos. 4, 12, 16, 45, 52, 99, 104, 107, 119, 125, 210a, 218, 220, 223, 244, and 245. I give below a few corrections, some of which may be merely variants in Folger copies. No. 30, the head-title is on sig. ²2A₁. No. 41, the signature is not A²χ²B-Q², etc., but A⁴B-Q², etc., for A₂ and A₃ are conjugate, sharing a watermark between them. Further, V₁ and [Y₁] are conjugate in the Folger copy (i. e. Y₁ = V₂); and page 75 is mis-numbered 71. No. 54, a vertical rule should be inserted after *London*. No. 57 should read ~~Eng~~=lish=Agree. The border on the second title-page is not exactly like that shown in fig. 22: the top central portion of the woodcut, which shows a crack in Day and Murrie's plate, has broken out and has been replaced by three pieces of ornament and a star. No 132 has G₁^r (page 23) mis-numbered 24; G₁^v is correctly numbered 24. I have recorded these details not to be captious but solely to aid those who do not have access to the song-books themselves. The *Bibliography* is a thoroughly excellent piece of work and indispensable as a book of reference.

JAMES G. McMANAWAY

The Folger Shakespeare Library

The Judicious Marriage of Mr. Hooker and the Birth of "The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity." By C. J. Sisson. Cambridge: at the University Press; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1940. Pp. xvi + 204. \$2.50.

Whatever dissatisfaction there may be with Professor Sisson's treatment of the bibliographical problems of Books vi, vii, and viii of *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, his proof that the famous marriage with Joan Churchman was truly judicious can never be challenged. In the Parish Register of St. Augustine's at Paul's Gate he finds that the date of that marriage was 13 February, 1587/8, thereby discrediting Walton's story of George Cranmer and Edwin Sandys finding Hooker at Drayton Beauchamp under that wife's hard regiment, denied to his friends and "called to rock the cradle." As Mr. Richard A. Houk has pointed out (*Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, Book VIII*, New York, 1931, p. 21), in his sceptical account of that incident, it must have "antedated February seventh 1585," when Hooker was named Master of the Temple. On the strength of new evidence Mr. Sisson con-

demns the tale and surmises that Hooker was "an absentee parson, like so many others of his day," for the whole period of his tenure of Drayton Beauchamp. Certainly he leaves no room for doubt that, if Hooker rocked a cradle there, the baby in it was not Joan Churchman's.

Of course there is no suspicion that she was not Hooker's first wife in these lectures. They simply explode the legend that she came to him portionless. Their marriage now seems to have attended Hooker's establishment in John Churchman's hospitable home ("the house of the Shunamite") by Sandys, whose long co-residence there figures in the Chancery suits from which much of the present evidence is taken. The picture of the Master of the Temple allowing his rival, Travers, to occupy his parsonage while he himself lived with his patron in his father-in-law's house in Watling Street, and there between 1588 and 1593 working out the design for all eight books of the *Laws* and preparing the first five of them for the press, fully corresponds with the bibliographical facts. The picture is not unconvincing. Mr. Houk has already stressed the fact that the publication of the first four books synchronized with the anti-Puritan debate in Parliament in 1593, when Sandys was actively opposed to the extreme Reformers. In showing that he subsidized Hooker to the extent of paying the whole cost of publishing the first five books, and of promising Hooker himself £50 for his work and paying him two substantial instalments on the appearance of the successive instalments of the *Laws* in 1593 and 1597, Mr. Sisson insinuates no venality in either patron or protégé. On the contrary, he sees both acting from conviction and bound together in an ideal friendship. In Hooker's letter of March 13, 1593, to Burleigh, in which he submitted his "simple doings" to that nobleman's "wise judgment," Mr. Sisson sees an instance of their integrity, for he regards the letter not as having accompanied the manuscript of all or of a part of the *Laws* in order to invite the Secretary to censor it, but rather as having gone to him with a copy of the edition of the first four books that was then fresh from Windet's press in order to present him boldly with the opinions of men to whom, as Travers' friend, he may well have been known to be opposed.

But now some ancient doubts arise. Though Mr. Houk's belief that "the charges of corruption of the manuscript copies made by Walton" are "baseless" (pp. 82-83) is now corroborated, Mr. Sisson cannot fully unravel the mystery. With a detective's skill he traces its ramifications back to Dr. John Spenser and exhumes some unwillingly unvarnished depositions of his which aggravate the inconsistency of his published statements. The testimony of John Churchman's agent, Culme, about his removal of Hooker's papers immediately after his death from Bishopshorne to the Churchman home in London, where they were parceled out to

Spenser, Dr. Henry Parry, Sandys, and Lancelot Andrewes, seems to exonerate Joan Churchman from suspicion of having connived at some interference with her husband's manuscripts. We seem now to be fully entitled to accept Spenser's statement in 1604 that Books vi and vii had reached him so nearly complete that by then his "purpose of setting forth the last three books" was well advanced. Mr. Sisson's chapter on "The Suppression of Hooker's Posthumous Manuscripts" surveys the motives which may have led Sandys to share George Cranmer's dissatisfaction with Book vi and so to contribute to its serious truncation as we have it, as well as to the delay about publishing the last three books until after his death. The most interesting point made here is the suggestion that "it is to Andrewes that we owe the preservation of what . . . remains" of Book vi. The most gratifying conclusion to all admirers of Hooker is the round assertion of the authenticity of Books vi and vii as we have them, coupled with permission to explain the disappointing weaknesses of style and argument in Book viii on the ground of the relatively incomplete state in which it reached Spenser.

MERRITT Y. HUGHES

The University of Wisconsin

The Poetry of Matthew Arnold; a Commentary. By C. B. TINKER and H. F. LOWRY. London and New York. Oxford University Press, 1940. Pp. xv + 404. \$3.50.

This work faithfully adheres to the purpose indicated in its subtitle: it is an invaluable bibliographical and critical commentary, designed to accompany a new edition of the complete *Poetical Works* of Matthew Arnold, to be published, possibly, in 1941. It is a guide, not a handbook. In spite of the dust-jacket's assertion, it is not, even in a wide sense, "a new history of Arnold's thoughts and feelings" during his poetic career. It is simply and admirably the presentation of all the important facts about each poem—its sources, genesis, composition, and publication, in so far as these facts are accessible. For the first time we have, in the thorough and painstaking work of Professors Tinker and Lowry, the materials for a clear and genuine account of Arnold's career as a poet. Many readers will lament that the editors have renounced the splendid opportunity to include in the volume an introductory essay on that subject; all will rejoice in the numerous fresh data and suggestions for ultimate conclusions. The occasion for the study was the discovery of a large amount of new information in the "Yale Papers," a seventy-page manuscript purchased from Dr. Gabriel Wells, containing notes, meditations, rough drafts of poems, and a

few unfinished lyrics. These papers, together with unpublished letters, journals, and marginalia have been utilized to solve many of the problems resulting from Arnold's habit of constantly rearranging, classifying, cancelling, restoring, and revising his poems. The study of these materials and of the poems themselves has enabled the editors to indicate new and illuminating emphases. "The Youth of Nature," for example, "in its final sentiment," is less Wordsworthian than classical after the manner of the Greek elegists (p. 188). We learn also to what a surprising extent Arnold's inspiration arose from *literary* sources, a fact which, the editors show, accounts for some of the blunders or confusion in such poems as "Tristram and Iseult," "The Church of Brou," "Haworth Churchyard," and "Stanzas from the Grande Chartreuse." As a man sensitive to style, he found poetic inspiration not merely in the ideas but also in the "moving and often fluid style" of George Sand, Emerson, and Senancour (p. 28).

But it is in the commentary on the great poems that the present volume attains its highest excellence. It supplies us with the first draft of "Lines Written in Kensington Gardens"; it makes invaluable use of the Yale Papers and an unpublished letter in analyzing "Empedocles on Etna" and in giving Arnold's own opinions and interpretations of that poem (pp. 287, 291-92); it indicates the sources, and the curious chronology of parts of "Dover Beach" (pp. 173-78); it presents Arnold's own explanation of "The New Sirens" (pp. 45-49); it affords a highly instructive source-study for "Balder Dead" (pp. 89-106); it quotes the letter to Wyndham Slade in 1850 which not only removes "Faded Leaves" from the Marguerite series but also reveals the poet as "surely not the Arnold of certain romantic accounts . . . a creature dwindled and marred for ever by his separation from Marguerite, a man who, cold and dejected, turned his attention to the inspection of schools and the writing of endless essays on politics and theology" (pp. 167-72). The question of Marguerite is settled in so far as it can now be settled: the "Switzerland" poems began in events, but "were altered and freely idealized according to the mood of the poet" (p. 155). Excellent commentaries are provided on "Resignation," "Rugby Chapel," and "Obermann," but no doubt the most revealing is that on "Obermann Once More" (pp. 261-74), where we learn the true nature of the Arnold of the 'sixties, his mature religious outlook, and the real roots of his poetry, with its classical finish and structure and its romantic "breath and engendering spirit." Space does not permit more than a mention of the fine commentaries on "The Scholar-Gypsy," "Thyrsis," "Sohrab and Rustum," "Merope", nor more than a recommendation that the lover of "The Scholar-Gypsy" read, in the appendix to the book, Sir Francis Wylie's account of "The Scholar-Gypsy Country." There are also quotations from the unpublished poems which every admirer of Arnold will pore over with keen interest.

It goes without saying that no study of Arnold's poetry can neglect this highly informative presentation of new materials and of critical commentary. It is not only a distinguished work, it is also one of the most useful contributions to Victorian studies in recent years.

CHARLES FREDERICK HARROLD

Michigan State Normal College

BRIEF MENTION

Lessing's Laokoon. By FRED O. NOLTE. Lancaster, Pa., Lancaster Press, 1940. 175 pages. This book whose title suggests Blumner's well-known monograph on *Lessing's Laokoon*, is very different from the latter work. Blumner wrote for historians of German literature, whereas Nolte's book seems to be primarily addressed to people interested in general aesthetics and art criticism. Read from this point of view, the book offers various interesting discussions, some of which, however, fail to get down to fundamentals. Nolte is perfectly right in pointing out the weakness of any philosophical definition of art, but he can not prove this assertion by calling his own definition of art as an "articulation of an aesthetic experience" a "sheer redundancy" (106 f.). Maybe it is—but I seem to remember definitions which were less redundant and more convincing (Hegel, Vischer, Jonas Cohn, Croce, Gentile). With the word aesthetic in it, the definition is doomed to redundancy, as this term, being an unknown factor itself, is used to explain another unknown factor. As to the concluding chapter, entitled *Criticism for the sake of Criticism* (164 ff.), I can not completely agree with Nolte that "criticism has nothing immediate to do with art" (170 ff.). It is true that criticism can not establish absolute rules which may serve as guides for future creations, but it can and should be the most helpful servant of the work of art, bridging whatever cleavages there may be between it and the public. To be sure, critical writings may have intrinsic value too, but that is not their main objective. One example may demonstrate this. No matter how valuable German criticism of Shakespeare may have been in itself during the past 200 years, its practical significance is what counts, as it was this criticism that paved the way for a true understanding of Shakespeare in Germany. In *Laokoon* the intrinsic value prevails, as its practical influence was of small import, but isn't this rather an exception to the rule than the rule?

HANS M. WOLFF

The University of Texas

The Poetry of Dorothy Wordsworth Edited from the *Journals* by HYMAN EIGERMAN New York: Columbia University Press, 1940. Pp. x + 114. \$2.00. This book, three-quarters or more of it blank paper, does not contain the authentic poetry of Dorothy Wordsworth that is included in the published works of her brother. It consists of a "Foreword" by Hoxie Neale Fairchild, a Preface by the editor, and 84 selections of (mostly) cadenced prose taken from the *Journals* of Dorothy Wordsworth as published by that incredibly bad editor William Knight. If the present book was worth doing at all, Mr. Eigerman should have tried to secure his text from the manuscript sources. He has extracted as well as he could, omitting some, but not all, of the prosy connective tissue of Dorothy's better passages, and has cut and printed them in lines of such length, uneven length, as may content him and others, which we are now asked to regard as verse. Like all the proponents of "free verse" known to me, he gives no sign of knowing anything about the history of rhythmical prose from the time of the Greeks, and of Plato and his students above all, down to Ruskin and De Quincey and others of our time. As for Dorothy Wordsworth, her poetic prose, with its pleasing metaphors and similes mainly drawn from the realm of external nature, is not an ornate prose of the highest order, and will not endure comparison with the best of her brother's prose and verse. Is it ungracious to say that as a poet she has been overrated in the vulgar effort to disparage her brother? We do well to point out what is excellent in her daily words and thoughts; perhaps there is excellence enough to warrant the display of her cadences by the present disproportionate use of blank pages and spaces. Most of the excerpts do not occupy a third of a page apiece. The warm affection of her brother leads us to share his gratitude to her. If he had not expressed it generously, she would not have had so many warm tributes from other sources.

LANE COOPER

Cornell University

Milton's Rhetoric. Studies in his Defense of Liberty. By WILBUR ELWYN GILMAN. Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 1939. Pp. 193. \$1.25. (The University of Missouri Studies, Volume XIV, Number 3.) This is a Cornell University doctoral dissertation. The author summarizes six of Milton's pamphlets, analyses their structure according to the Aristotelian rhetorical scheme as he understands it, and attempts to set forth the circumstances in which each was composed and published. The summary of Milton's argument is surely something of a work of supererogation. The author's analysis of the rhetoric deals in a decidedly wooden way with only the most obvious features of

Milton's impassioned and often turgid pleading and throws no fresh light on seventeenth-century rhetorical theory and practice. The author has nothing to tell us of the effect on Milton's methods of persuasion of the Ramist logic on which he had been bred and of which he himself wrote a text-book. His discussion of the contemporary historical setting of the tracts is abstracted from a few of the older secondary sources such as Masson and Gardiner and takes no account of recent work on the subject. The very first page of the first chapter, dealing with the background of *Areopagitica*, is a small triumph of inaccurate and imprecise statement. No doubt the preparation of this study contributed something to the author's education, but it is difficult to see what it contributes to our knowledge of Milton.

WILLIAM HALLER

Columbia University

Biography by Americans 1658-1936, A Subject Bibliography. By EDWARD H. O'NEILL. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1939 Pp. x + 465. \$4.00. This comprehensive bibliography, of some seven thousand items, is a companion piece to Mr. O'Neill's *History of American Biography* (1935). It attempts to list all biographies in book form (except unimportant works, such as insignificant campaign biographies, in the case of particularly famous men), written by Americans and published during the years 1658 to 1936. The first section, of 409 pages, lists individual biographies by subject; the second, of 55 pages, lists collective biographies by author. Each item has author, title, pagination, place and date of publication (of the edition the compiler found convenient to use), and symbols indicating that copies are held by one or more of the following libraries: Library of Congress, New York Public Library, American Antiquarian Society, Huntington Library, University of Pennsylvania, Burton Historical Collection, William L. Clements Library, and the John Carter Brown Library. Most of the items are in the Library of Congress. No attempt has been made to evaluate the items—warning is not given, for example, that A. C. Buell's biography of John Paul Jones is based in part upon manufactured sources. Biographical material in periodicals is not included. There is no index, and one will have some difficulty in locating works by a particular author.

This handy reference work includes subjects, living and dead, omitted from the *Dictionary of American Biography*, and in other ways supplements the *Dictionary*. The student of all aspects of American life will find it informing, and even stimulating. Certainly he will be struck by the range of American biographical writing, by the variety and color of its subject matter, and will, I believe, join the reviewer in feeling grateful to Mr. O'Neill for his painstaking and useful bibliography.

BERNARD MAYO

The University of Virginia

Shelley in America in the Nineteenth Century. His Relation to American Critical Thought and His Influence. By JULIA POWER. Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1940. Pp. viii + 225. \$1.50. This University of Nebraska doctoral thesis divides Shelley's impact upon American literature into three periods, 1830-50, 1850-72, and 1872-1900, with a final brief comment on Shelley in twentieth-century America. It is a minor disappointment that, if the twentieth century was to receive a glance, Miss Power should have ignored its most conspicuous Shelleyan, Elmore Wylie, who devoted her first royalties to the purchase of Shelley manuscripts, whose poetry shows a curious love of Shelley that is of definite psychological interest, and who actually revived the drowned poet and brought him to America in a novel.

A more serious flaw is that the book practically ignores the obligation imposed by the sub-title. The collection of factual data is indeed thorough. According to my experience it is practically complete, but careful mention of everything an American author says of Shelley still does not reveal how Shelley influenced his style and his social, political, and critical opinions. Massed factual detail still requires interpretation before its impact upon the thought of any particular generation or region becomes clear. Doubtless such a genuinely critical study would be too complicated and far-reaching for most American doctoral candidates. Nevertheless, Miss Power might have profited by a preliminary study of Henri Peyre's *Shelley et la France*, or by an organization which traced Shelley's influence more on the basis of his salient aims and qualities.

NEWMAN I. WHITE

Duke University

The Reverend Colonel Finch. By ELIZABETH NITCHIE. New York. Columbia University Press, 1940. Pp. x + 109. \$1.50. Professor Nitchie's little book is in many ways a model of scholarship: it is a worthy contribution to learning, is not too long, is scrupulously exact, and is well written and interesting. Students of Byron and the Shelleys will be grateful for the discovery that the Reverend Colonel Calicot Finch was no other than Robert Finch, M. A. of Balliol College; and especially for the delightful news that "Calicot" was only a nickname given him privately by the Shelleys, who borrowed it from Biddy Fudge's lover in Thomas Moore's *The Fudge Family in Paris*.

The few lines on Finch in the *DNB* will show how very much Professor Nitchie has contributed to Finch's biography. Even more important is her careful revelation of his character, for Finch was an extremely interesting person. A relative of Baron

Munchausen he unquestionably was; his tall tales and assumed military title made Byron, the Shelleys, and many others laugh. But there was another side to Finch. He was a man of wide and occasionally deep learning, and he certainly commanded the respect of many learned and artistic persons of Italy and England. The most interesting of his literary associations were with Crabb Robinson, Leigh Hunt, Charles Brown, Joseph Severn, and T. J. Hogg, all of whom took pains to write him good letters. His tragedy was that his talents were mediocre while his thirst for fame was great. The pretentious monument that marks his grave (not far from Shelley's) in the Protestant Cemetery in Rome is a fitting symbol of his life—the ostentation of an illustrious obscure. Professor Nitchie's book will hereafter cause some few to pause before Finch's tomb after they have paid their tribute to Shelley and Keats.

The large collection of Finch manuscripts and relics which Professor Nitchie discovered at Oxford and from which the greater part of her material was drawn contains, among much else, Finch's lengthy diaries and seventeen volumes of correspondence with an astonishing variety of people.

FREDERICK L. JONES

Mercer University

Annals of the New York Stage, Volume XII [1882-1885]. By GEORGE C. D. ODELL. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940. Pp xix + 733. \$8.75. This volume covers what is generally regarded as the "golden age" of the New York theatre. It records the advent of Henry Irving and Ellen Terry, the popularity of Daly's, the beginning of the Metropolitan Opera House, the triumphs of Adelina Patti. Professor Odell is indefatigable in his researches, and his books contain materials indispensable to the student of American drama and music. The profusion of illustrations, both playbills and photographs, and the careful indexes make the entire series the standard reference guide to the history of the American theatre.

N. BRYLLION FAGIN

The Johns Hopkins University

The Great Diamond Robbery, & Other Recent Melodramas. By EDWARD M. ALFRIEND and A. C. WHEELER, CLARENCE BENNETT, CHARLES A. TAYLOR, LILLIAN MORTIMER, and WALTER WOODS. Edited by GARRETT H. LEVERTON. *Five Plays*. By CHARLES H. HOYT. Edited by DOUGLAS L. HUNT. *The Banker's Daughter, &*

Other Plays. By BRONSON HOWARD. Edited by ALLAN G. HALL-
LINE. *An Arrant Knave, & Other Plays.* By STEELE MACKAYE.
Edited by PERCY MACKAYE. *The Cowled Lover, & Other Plays.*
By ROBERT MONTGOMERY BIRD. Edited by EDWARD H. O'NEILL.
America's Lost Plays, edited by BARRETT H. CLARK, vols. VIII-XII.
Princeton University Press, 1940-41. Pp. xvi + 260, xvi + 244,
xiv + 310, xviii + 238, x + 228. \$5.00 a volume, \$85 the set of
20 vols.* Five more volumes in the welcome series noticed in this
journal for June, 1941 (LVI, 475-76).

H. S.

CORRESPONDENCE

SOCIÉTÉ GENEVOISE DE LINGUISTIQUE Les linguistes de Genève viennent
de se grouper sous la direction de MM Charles Bally et Alb Sechehaye
en une association, la *Société genevoise de linguistique*, dont le but est
"de contribuer d'une façon générale à l'avancement de la science lin-
guistique, principalement en étudiant les systèmes de langues à la lumière
des principes et des méthodes de Ferdinand de Saussure" La société est
également accessible, aux mêmes conditions que pour les membres locaux,
aux personnes domiciliées dans le reste de la Suisse et à l'étranger, ainsi
qu'aux sociétés, bibliothèques, instituts et séminaires, etc Elle fera
paraître un organe, les *Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure*, qui contiendra des
travaux originaux, le compte-rendu des publications reçues et le procès-
verbal des séances, les membres le recevront gratuitement ou à prix réduit
Pour tous renseignements, s'adresser au secrétaire, M. Henri Frei, Pro-
fesseur à l'Université de Genève (Adresse *Perly*, canton de Genève, Suisse)

THE EDITORS

MAUPASSANT Mr Artine Artiman has formed what he believes to be
the most nearly complete collection of Maupassantiana in the world.
Beside biographical and critical studies, it includes first editions of all of
Maupassant's works, collected works, English translations, editions pre-
pared for the classroom, dramatic adaptations of his works, copies of
"Gil Blas," in which many of his tales first appeared, notes on studies
that appeared in newspapers and magazines, and other miscellaneous
material He has made this collection, housed at his home in Annandale,
accessible to scholars, who may address him at Bard College, Annandale-
on-Hudson, New York.

THE EDITORS

INDEX

SUBJECTS

- Adams, John Quincy
Oberon: A Poetical Romance in Twelve Books Translated from the German of Wieland by — 225.
- Algonquin, The Viking and the Red Man, the O N Origin of the — Language 243
- American Civilization
 Civilisation américaine 302, Positivism in the U S (1853-1861) 320, Romanticism in America 477
- American Drama
 America's Lost Plays 475, 639; Annals of the New York Stage 639
- American Literature
 Biography by Americans 1658-1936, a Subject Bibliography 637, The New England Mind The 17th Century 302, The Small Town in — 302, Studies in Literary Types in 17th Century America (1607-1710) 79; Traditions in — 319.
- American Novel, The 308.
- American Poetry
 Modern Poetry and the Tradition 388
- Anglo-Latin Poetry
 Musae Anglicanae. A History of — 628
- Ariosto, see Harington
- Aristotelian Papers, Revised and Reprinted 77
- Arnold, Matthew
 — Poetry and Prose, with William Watson's Poem and Essays by Lionel Johnson and H W. Garrod 378, On the Diction of Tennyson, Browning and — 378, The Poetry of —; a Commentary 633, Three New Letters of — 552
- Arthurian Romance and Modern Poetry and Music 481.
- assiet* 414
- Astrological Prognostications in MS 775 of the Pierpont Morgan Library 351.
- automobile*, see *locomotive*
- Bacon, see Burton, Robert²
- Bale, John
 — A Study in the Minor Literature of the Reformation 561
- Banks, John
 A Note on Blair's Edition of *The Unhappy Favourite* 280
- Batteux, Charles
 Zur Bedeutung —'s fur Lenz 508.
- Baudelaire
 Sur deux lettres de — 338
- Beaumont
 A Note on — and Fletcher's *Love's Pilgrimage* and *The Chances* 122, Studies in —, Fletcher, and Massinger 144.
- Behn, Aphra
 — and Montfleury 562.
- Benserade
 — and his *Ballets de cour* 555
- Beowulf*
 Hygd 356
- Berners, see Skelton.
- binôme* 426
- Blake, William
 Windows of the Morning, a Critical Study of —'s *Poetical Sketches* 314
- Boswell, James
 The Dark Hints of Sir John Hawkins and — 325; Dr Johnson, Mrs Thrale, and —: Three Letters 525
- Botango*, an English Ghost-Word 65
- Brant
 A Supplement to Zarncke's Note on —'s *Narrenschiff*, Cap 13, 1 139
- Browne, Moses — and the 1783 Edition of Giles and Phineas Fletcher 288
- Browning, Robert, see Tennyson
- Brunt, Captain Samuel, *A Voyage to Cacklogallma* 158
- Bunner, Henry Cuyler
 The Life and Letters of — 400.
- Burke, Edmund — and his Literary Friends 479.

- Burton, Robert
—, Bacon, and Sandys 271. —ian
Melancholy in the Plays of John
Ford 482
- Byron
—'s Return from Greece 618. "A
Paradise within thee" in Milton,
—, and Shelley 615.
- Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure 640
- Carew, Thomas —. Thomas Carey,
and "The Sovereign of the Seas"
268
- Carey, Thomas, see Carew, Thomas
- Carole, Etude sur la — médiévale,
l'origine du mot et ses rapports
avec l'église 222.
- Carter, Robert
Letters of — 1720-1727 The
Commercial Interests of a Vir-
ginia Gentleman 240
- Cather, Willa, see Fiance, Anatole
- Caxton, see Skelton
- Chapman, George
— and Phaer 599
- Chapman, John, see Eliot, George
- Chateaubriand
A Note on —'s Documentary Ac-
curacy 217.
- Chaucer
—'s *Troilus*, a Study in Courtly
Love 300. —'s Two-Mile Pilgrim-
age 205; The Apocrypha and —'s
House of Fame 583; The Dual
Time-Scheme in —'s *Troilus* 94.
The Friendship of —'s Summoner
and Pardoner 138, Is —'s Monk a
Monk? 80, The Last of the Mil-
ler's Head? 534, An Observation
on —'s *Astrolabe* 530; On Reread-
ing — 69, Three Notes on the
Text of the *Canterbury Tales* 163
- Chester Cycle
Antichrist and the *Prophets of*
Antichrist in the — 620.
- Chrétien de Troyes
"Or est venuz qui aunera". a
Medieval Dictum 405; The Silk
Factory in — *Yvain* 418
- Cobbett, William
Peter Porcupine in America The
Career of —, 1792-1800 320.
- Coleridge
—The Talker, a Series of Con-
temporary Descriptions and Com-
ments 472; —'s Mount Abora
376, A Concordance to the Poetry
of — 396, The Road to Tryer-
maine, a Study of the History,
Background, and Purposes of —'s
Christabel 381
- Comte de Poitiers 469
- Corneille, Thomas
The Sources of —'s *Comtesse*
d'Orgueil 211
- Crashaw, Richard — a Study in
Baroque Sensibility 471
- Criticism
Humanism and Imagination 309,
Literary —, Plato to Dryden 560
- Cyme, a Purgative Drug 263
- Dad Sow 140
- Daude de Pradas
Auzels Cassadors, V 2334 429
- défendre* (se) 81.
- Dehmel, see Housman
- Dekker
New Source Influence on *The*
Shoemaker's Holiday 127.
- Dennis, John
The Johnsonian Tradition in the
Comedies of — 370
- De Quincey a Portrait 378
- Descartes
Le poëte de — 110
- Desjardins, Mlle — and the "Apolo-
gie du luxe" 209
- Desportes, see Gil Polo
- Dickens
On the Serial Publication of *Ol-
iver Twist* 290
- Diderot and Donne's BIAΘANATOS
114.
- Diodorus Siculus, see Skelton
- Disraeli and John Gibson Lockhart
134.
- Donne, John
—and the Bezoar 609, —'s
"bracelet of bright hair about the
bone" 366, —'s Imagery A
Study in Creative Sources 626,
—'s "Little Rag," 607, —'s Sui-
cides 129; Diderot and —'s
BIAΘANATOS 114
- Dorset, Charles Sackville
"Though, Phyllis, your prevailing
charms" 529.
- Dostoevski, the Making of a Novel-
ist 463
- Dryden, John
—, a Bibliography of Early Edi-
tions and of —iana 74

Eichendorff

Der junge — und Novalis' Naturpantheismus 161

Elegy, see Pastoral Elegy

Eliot, George

— and John Chapman, with Chapman's Diaries 559

Elizabeth England's Eliza 234

Elyot, Sir Thomas

— against Poetry 597, —'s *The Defence of Good Women* 620.

English Church History

Kirchengeschichte und Rechtsgeschichte in England (von der Reformation bis zum frühen 18. Jahrhundert) 385

English Drama

Annals of —, 975-1700 561, The "Closet" and the "Stage" in 1759 282, Die Entwicklung des sozialen Dramas in England vor Galsworthy 620, Das historische Drama in England von der Romantik bis zur Gegenwart 620, Revivals and Importations of French Comedies in England, 1749-1800 305

English Jurisprudence, see English Church History

English Literature

The Rise of Romantic Hellenism in —, 1732-1786 237; Some 17th Century Worthies in a 20th Century Mirror 620

English Novel

The Gothic Quest 561

English Painting

Painter and Poet, Studies in the Literary Relations of — 236.

English Poetry

From Donne to Dryden The Revolt against Metaphysical Poetry 312; Modern Poetry and the Tradition 388, The New Oxford Book of English Verse 478, The Poet's Work 79, Religious Trends in —, Vol. 1, 1700-1740: Protestantism and the Cult of Sentiment 146; Ten Victorian Poets 479

English Song-Books, 1651-1702 A Bibliography, with a First-line Index of Songs 630.

Esthetics, A History of — 79

Fénelon

An Unpublished Letter of — 106

Fielding, John

An Attack on — 523

Finch, The Reverend Colonel — 638.

Fletcher, Giles, see Browne, Moses

Fletcher, John, see Beaumont

Fletcher, Phineas, see Browne, Moses, and Spenser, Edmund

Ford, John

Burtoman Melancholy in the Plays of — 482

France, Anatole

Borrowings from — by Willa Cather and Robert Nathan 377; The Composition of —'s *l'Orme du mail* 245.

French Chivalry, see Old French

French poetry

Le Mystère Poétique 464.

Friðþjófs Saga

An Oriental Theme in the — 454

Fromont, a Traitor in the *chansons de geste* 329

Fuller, Henry Blake 67

Gaelic

Two — Variants of "The Two Sisters" 187

Galsworthy's Genealogical Error 619

General View of the Stage, The Authorship of A — 612

German

Historische deutsche Grammatik, 1. Band Geschichtliche Einleitung, Lautlehre 157

German Drama

German Dramatists of the 19th Century 557; Geschichtsdrama und nationaler Mythos Grenzfragen zur Gegenwartsform des Dramas 152

German Lexicography 14.

German Poetry

Der deutsche Dichter um die Jahrhundertwende und seine Abgelöstheit von der Gesellschaft 75

Gilpin, William

The Life and Work of — 147

Gil Polo, Desportes, and Lyly's "Cupid and My Campaspe" 606.

Giraudoux, Jean

The Cliché Basis for Some of the Metaphors of — 435.

Goethe

—'s Works with the exception of *Faust* 297; Pushkin and — 24; Rousseau and *Faust* 324; *Urfaust*: Wer erst von Geists Erweirung sprach! 90, see also 483.

- Gothic
 Die Syntax des Komparativs im Gotischen, Althochdeutschen, und Altsächsischen 480
gothique, The Adjective — in the 18th Century 498
 Gourmont, Remy de —, *essai de biographie intellectuelle* 466
 Gray, see Shelley
- Hardy of Wessex His Life and Literary Career 308
 Harrington and Ariosto A Study in Elizabethan Verse Translation 620
 Hauptmann's "*So lange Gott nimmt, nehm ich auch*" 447.
 Hawkins, John, see Boswell, James
 Hawthorne, Nathaniel
 —'s Contemporaneous Reputation A Study of Literary Opinion in England and America 1824-1864 67, A propos de "— en France" 343
 Hebbels Menschengestaltung als dichterischer Ausdruck nordisch-deutschen Wesens 153
 Herod and Mariamne, The Tragedies of — 151
 Holderlin 230.
 Holmes, Oliver Wendell Representative Selections 156.
 Hooker, Richard
 The Judicious Marriage of Mr — and the Birth of *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* 631
 Housman, A. E.
 —'s *More Poems*, VII and Dehmel's *Trost* 215, An Emendation to —'s Translation from Euripides' *Alcestis* (962-1005) 458.
 Humanism, see Criticism.
- Imagination, see Criticism
 Italian Carnival Songs
 Nuovi Canti Carnascialeschi del Rinascimento 72
- Jacobi
Die Winterreise 66.
 James, Henry
 Another Reading of *The Turn of the Screw* 196
Jardin des Muses
 Malherbe, Saint-Gelays, Tabourot, Théophile, and the — 492
 Johnson, Lionel, see Arnold
- Johnson, Samuel
 Dr —, Mrs Thrale, and Boswell Three Letters 525, Perilous Balance The Tragic Genius of Swift, —, and Sterne 394
 Jonson, Ben
 Classical Influence upon the Tribe of Ben A Study of Classical Elements in the Non-Dramatic Poetry of — and his Circle 241, Mechanical Features of a 17th Century Submarine 202, The —ian Tradition in the Comedies of John Dennis 370
- Keats, George 398
 Keats 159
 Kleist
 A "Falsified Verse" in —'s *Homburg?* 321
 Kyd, Thomas
 Die dramatische Technik —s 385
- Lahontan and Critical Deism 522.
 Lamb, Charles
 The Character in the *Elia* Essays 374.
 Lanier, Sidney
 A Concordance to the Poems of — 396
 Lawrence, D. H. — and Susan his Cow 388
 Leishman, J. B., see AUTHORS OF ARTICLES AND OF BOOKS REVIEWED
 Le Mierie, see Lillo
 Lenz, J. M. R.
 Ein unbekannter Brief —ens an Boie 445, see also Batteux
 Lessing's *Laokoon* 635
 Lilburne, see Milton.
 Lillo
The London Merchant and Le Mierie's *Barnevelt* 432
 Lindsay, Nicholas Vachel
 Letters of — to A. J. Armstrong 483
 Literary Criticism, see Criticism
 Literary Theory, see Renaissance
 Literary Theory
 Literature, The Growth of — 401
 Lockhart, John Gibson, see Disraeli
locomotive et automobile 403
 Louisiana French Folk Songs 481
 Lyly, see Gil Polo
- McHenry, James
 — (1785-1845) Playwright and Novelist 67

Maginn, William, see *Whitehall*
 Malherbe, see *Jardin des Muses*
 Mansel, Jean
 An Eighth *Vengeance Alexandre*
 409
 Mariamne, see Herod
 Marlowe, Christopher
 — A Biographical and Critical
 Study 141, —'s Imagery and the
 — Canon 620, Some Observations
 on the 1663 Edition of *Faustus*
 588
 Maumontel as a Source of Stendhal
 433
 Massinger, see Beaumont.
 Maupassant 640
 Melancholy, see Shakespeare
 Mexia, Pedro, see Shakespeare.
 Meyer, Conrad Ferdinand
 Maske und Gesicht in den Werken
 —s 473
 Middle English Literature, Early —
 218.
 Milton
 —in Chancery 392, A — Hand-
 book 392, —'s Callimachus 278,
 —'s Literary Milieu 392; —'s
 Rhetoric Studies in his Defense
 of Liberty 636, The Burning of
 —'s *Defensio* in France 275; A.
 Dublin — Enthusiast 284, An
 Early 18th Century Rhymed
 Paraphrase of *Paradise Lost*, II,
 1-225 133, Lilburne's Note on —
 360, Nathanael Salmon on —,
 1728 214, "On the new forcers of
 Conscience," Line 17 62; "A
 Paradise within Thee" in —, By-
 ron, and Shelley 615
Mirror for Magistrates
 A Metrical Puzzle in the — 258
 Moffet, Thomas
 Nobilis, or, a View of the Life
 and Death of a Sidney, and Les-
 sus Lugubris 628.
 Molière
 The Spirit of —, an Interpreta-
 tion 150
 Monasteries, A Map of Old English
 — and related ecclesiastical
 Foundations A. D 400-1066 306.
 Montaigne
 Quelques aspects démocratiques
 de la philosophie de — 485
 Montfleury, see Behn, Aphra.
 Motley, John Lothrop. Representa-
 tive Selections 156.
 Music, Elizabethan — and —al
 Criticism 242

Nathan, Robert, see Fiance, Anatole.
 Neruda, Pablo
 Poesia y estilo de — 459.
 Novalis, see Eichendorff

 Old English Monasteries, see Monas-
 teries
 Old French
 An Analysis of the Long Prayers
 in — Literature with Special Ref-
 erence to the 'Biblical-Creed-Nar-
 rative' Prayers 402; Chivalric
 Ideas and Practices in Medieval
 France 482, Fromont, a Traitor
 in the *Chansons de geste* 329
 Old Germanic Principles of Name-
 Giving, The 390
 Old High German
 Die Syntax des Komparativs im
 Gotischen, Althochdeutschen, und
 Altsächsischen 480.
 Old Saxon, see Old High German

 Paston, Sir John
 —'s *Grete Booke*, a 15th Century
 "Best Seller" 345.
 Pastoral Elegy (The) An An-
 thology 242
Pathelin 42
 Paul, Jean, see Richter
 Pearl 'Inlyche' and 'Rewarde' 457.
 Penquer, Auguste
 A Breton Romanticist, Mme —
 541
 Percy, Thomas
 "Gill Morice" in the *Reliques*
 Again 286
 Pestell, Thomas
 The Poems of — 620
 Phaer, Thomas, see Chapman,
 George.
 Phelps, Elizabeth Stuart 67
Piers Plowman
 The Character "Liberum Arbi-
 trium" in the C-Text of — 449.
Poêle (le) 110
 Polo, Gaspar Gil, see Gil Polo
 Positivism in the U S (1853-1861)
 320
 Printing 17th Century Publishing
 Economy 61
Puritan 456
 Pushkin and Goethe 24

 Rainolds, John
 Oratio in Laudem Artis Poeticae
 628.

- Randolph, Thomas
Some Unpublished Verses by — 264, 484
- Reade, Charles
—, *sa vie, ses romans* 313, *It's Never Too Late to Mend* 313
- Redentiner Osterspiel, Das 474
- Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice Classicism in the Rhetoric and Poetic of Italy, France, and England 1400-1600 149
- Review of *English Studies* 324.
- Richter
Jean Paul Der schöpferische Humor 228
- Rilke, Rainer Maria
— *Duino Elegies* 155. Translations from the Poetry of — 155
- Rivas, Duque de
An Echo of our War with Mexico in a Legend of the — 115
- Robinson, Edwin Arlington
Philosophy in the Poetry of — 317
- Rochester's "buffoon concert" 372
- Ronsaid Prince of Poets 231
- Rossetti, Dante Gabriel
Letters of — to Fanny Cornforth 399
- Rousseau and *Faust* 324.
- Saint-Gelays, see *Jardin des Muses*.
- Salmon, Nathanael — on Milton, 1728 214.
- Sand, George
An Exchange of Notes over — 548
- Sandys, see Burton.
- Satire, The Art of — 318
- Schlegel, Friedrich
—s *Alarcos* und die Umbildung der Frühromantik 513
- scorsonère* 243
- Scott, Sir Walter
Epic Suggestion in the Imagery of the Waverley Novels 239; *Ivanhoe* and Simms' *Vasconselos* 294
- Scottish Literature. Die nationale Literatur Schottlands von den Anfängen bis zur Renaissance 78
- Shakespeare
— in Germany 1740-1815 385, — Studies *Julius Caesar* 620; —'s *Macbeth* als Drama des Barock 385, The Elizabethan Idea of Melancholy 261, Jacques' "Seven Ages" and Pedro Mexia 601; Macduff, Not Macbeth 603, A Prose Period in —'s Career? 113, *Romeo and Juliet* as an Experimental Tragedy 620, The Textual Evidence for "The School of Night" 176, The Variants in the First Quarto of *King Lear*, a Bibliographical and Critical Inquiry 624
- Shelley
— in America in the 19th Century his Relation to American Critical Thought and his Influence 638; —'s Use of Gray's Poetry 192, Notes on the Text of —'s Translations from Plato 536, "A Paradise within Thee" in Milton, Byron, and — 615
- Sidney's Metaphor of the Ulcer 56
- Silvius, Aeneas
Aeneas Silvii de Liberorum Educatione 160
- Simms, see Scott, Sir Walter
- Skelton
Versions by —, Caxton, and Berners of a Prologue by Diodorus Siculus 252
- Smollett, Tobias
— and the *Universal History* 1
- Société genevoise de linguistique 640.
- Spanish
A Lexicographic Mirage 34
- Spender, Stephen, see AUTHORS OF ARTICLES AND OF BOOKS REVIEWED
- Spenser
A Borrowing from — by Phineas Fletcher 273, The Ladder of Lechery, *The Faerie Queene*, III, 1, 45 594, Rhetoric in —'s Poetry 620, A Study of —'s Gentleman 620
- Stendhal, see Marmontel
- Sterne, see Swift
- Stifter, Adalbert
Kurzform und Langform bei — 439
- Stockton, Frank R 67
- Swift
Perilous Balance. The Tragic Genius of —, Johnson, and Sterne 394
- Submarine, see Jonson, Ben
- Suckling, John
A Misdating of "A Ballade upon a Wedding" 368.
- Tabourot, see *Jardin des Muses*
- Tate, Nahum —, Laureate Two Biographical Notes 611.

- Taylor, Tom — and the Victorian Drama 476
- Tennyson
The Age of — 378, On the Dictation of —, Browning, and Arnold 378
- Théophile, see *Jardin des Muses*
- Thillois
The Date of —'s *Solyman II* 431
- Thrale, Mrs., see Johnson, Samuel
- Towneley Plays
A Restored Reading in the Towneley Purification Play 358
- "Two Sisters" (The), see Gaelic
- Universal History, see Smollett
- Vegetius
The Elizabethan Translation of —' *De Re Militari* 605
- Venjançe *Alizandre*, see Mansel, Jean
- Virginia
The First Gentlemen of — 316
- Voltaire
— à d'Argental (juillet 1759) 504, —'s *Brutus* during the French Revolution 100, —'s *Poème sur la loi naturelle* 233, Bibliographical Data on — from 1931-1940 563, The Conclusion of —'s *Poème sur le désastre de Lisbonne* 422
- Walpole, Horace
The Yale Edition of —'s Correspondence Vols II-VIII —'s Correspondence with Mme du Defand and Wiart 310
- Walther von der Vogelweide Zum Leich —s 54
- Walton, Izaak — a Stationer? 363
- Wasseimann, Jakob —'s *Lukardis* 47
- Watson, Wilham, see Arnold, Matthew
- Whitehall, The Authorship of — (1827) 207
- Wieland, see Adams, John Quincy.
- Wordsworth, Dorothy
The Poetry of — Edited from the *Journals* 636

AUTHORS OF ARTICLES AND OF BOOKS REVIEWED

- Allen, D C, Donne and the Bezoar 609, Donne's Suicides 129; Jacques' "Seven Ages" and Pedro Mexico 601
- Alonso, A, Poesía y estilo de Pablo Neruda 459
- Alspach, R K, A Dublin Milton Enthusiast 284
- Armour, R W and Howes, R F. (eds), Coleridge the Talker 472
- Armstrong, A J (ed), Letters of Nicholas Vachel Lindsay to A J Armstrong 483
- Arneke, H, Kirchengeschichte und Rechtsgeschichte in England 385
- Aubin, R A, Nathanael Salmon on Milton, 1728 214.
- Baldauf, E., Die Syntax des Komparativs im Gotischen, Althochdeutschen und Altsächsischen 480
- Baldensperger, F, A propos de "Nathaniel Hawthorne en France" 343
- Baldwin, C S and Clark, D L (ed), Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice 149
- Bang, C K, Maske und Gesicht in den Werken Conrad Ferdinand Meyers 473
- Barr, M-M H, Bibliographical Data on Voltaire from 1931-1940 563
- Bartlett, P B, Chapman and Phaer 599
- Baum, P F (ed), Letters of Dante Gabriel Rossetti to Fanny Cornforth 399.
- Bennett, M A, Elizabeth Stuart Phelps 67
- Bennett, R. E, *Puritan* 456.
- Berger, K, Jean Paul 228
- Bielfeldt, F, Hebbels Menschengestaltung als dichterischer Ausdruck nordisch-deutschen Wesens 153
- Biesterfeldt, P. W., Die dramatische Technik Thomas Kyds 385
- Bishop, M, Ronsard Prince of Poets 231
- Blair, T M H, see Lumiansky, R. M
- Blanc, R E, James McHenry 67.
- Blankenagel, J C, Jakob Wassermann's *Lukardis* 47.
- Bluhm, H, A Supplement to Zarncke's Note on Brant's *Narrenschiff*, Cap 13, 1 139.

- Boas, F. S., Christopher Marlowe 141
 Boas, G. (ed.), Romanticism in America 477
 Boyd, M. C., Elizabethan Music and Musical Criticism 242
 Bradner, L., Musae Anglicanae 628
 Bressie, R., Chaucer's Monk Again 161
 Brewster, P. G., Two Gaelic Variants of "The Two Sisters" 187
 Brue, F., Die nationale Literatur Schottlands von den Anfängen bis zur Renaissance 78
 Brooks, C., Modern Poetry and the Tradition 388
 Brown, C., Three Notes on the Text of the *Canterbury Tales* 163
 Bryant, D. C., Edmund Burke and his Literary Friends 479
 Buchan, H. (ed.), The Poems of Thomas Pestell 620
 Buhler, C. F., Astrological Prognostications in MS 775 of the Pierpont Morgan Library 351, Sir John Paston's *Grete Booke*, a 15th Century "Best Seller" 345.
 Buell, L. M., A Prose Period in Shakespeare's Career? 118.
 Carleton, P. D., John Donne's "bracelet of bright hair about the bone" 366.
 Cawley, R. R., Burton, Bacon, and Sandys 271
 Chadwick, H. M. and N. K., The Growth of Literature 401.
 Chambers, E. K. (ed.), Arnold Poetry and Prose 378
 Chapman, P. A., The Spirit of Molière 150
 Chappell, L. W., Dad Sow 140
 Charlton, H. B., *Romeo and Juliet* as an Experimental Tragedy 620
 Clark, B. H. (ed.), America's Lost Plays 475, 639
 Clark, D. L., see Baldwin, C. S.
 Clark, E. M., A Restored Reading in the Towneley Purification Play 358
 Clark, H. H. see Hayakawa, S. I.
 Clark, M. E., Peter Porcupine in America 320
 Cline, C. L., Disraeli and John Gibson Lockhart 134
 Coles, B., Shakespeare Studies *Julius Caesar* 620.
 Coon, A. M., Izaak Walton a Stationer? 363.
 Cooper, L., Aristotelian Papers 77.
 Crowley, F. J. (ed.), Voltaire's *Poème sur la loi naturelle* 233
 Dabney, L. E., The Date of Thilo's *Solyma II* 431
 Dane II, N., Milton's Callimachus 278
 Daniels, R. B., Some 17th Century Worthies in a 20th Century Mirror 620
 Dapp, K. G., George Keate 398
 David, J., Quelques aspects démocratiques de la philosophie de Montaigne 485
 Day, C. L. and Murrie, E. B., English Song-Books 630
 Dennis, L., "Gill Morice" in the *Reliques* Again 286
 Deutschbein, M., Shakespeare's *Macbeth* als Drama des Barock 385.
 Dorian, D. C., "On the new forcers of Conscience," Line 17 62
 Dunlap, R., Some Unpublished Verses by Thomas Randolph 264, 484; Thomas Carew, Thomas Carey, and "The Sovereign of the Seas" 268
 Edwards, H., Galsworthy's Genealogical Error 619.
 Eigerman, H. (ed.), The Poetry of Dorothy Wordsworth 636
 Elliott, G. R., Humanism and Imagination 309
 Elmquist, K. E., An Observation on Chaucer's *Astrolabe* 530
 Ewing, S. B., Burtonian Melancholy in the Plays of John Ford 482
 Facticeau, B. A., An Unpublished Letter of Fénelon 106
 Fagin, N. B., Another Reading of *The Turn of the Screw* 196.
 Fairchild, H. N., Religious Trends in English Poetry 146
 Faust, A. B. (ed.), J. Q. Adams (tr.), Wieland, *Oberon* 225
 Faust, B., Hawthorne's Contemporaneous Reputation 67
 Fay, B., Civilisation américaine 302.
 Fay, E. G., Borrowings from Anatole France by Willa Cather and Robert Nathan 377
 Feuillerat, A., Sur deux lettres de Baudelaire 338
 Fiske, C. F., Epic Suggestion in the Imagery of the Waverley Novels 239.

- FitzGerald, T. A., An Echo of our War with Mexico in a Legend of the Duque de Rivas 115
- Frank, G., *Patheln* 42
- French, J. M., The Burning of Milton's *Defensio* in France 275, Milton in Chancery 392
- Frenz, H., Die Entwicklung des sozialen Dramas in England vor Galsworthy 620
- Fricker, R., Das historische Drama in England von der Romantik bis zur Gegenwart 620
- Garrod, H. W., Keats 159, see also Arnold under SUBJECTS
- Gilbert, A. H., The Ladder of Lechery, *The Faerie Queene*, III, 1, 45 594; Literary Criticism 560
- Gilbert, K. E. and Kuhn, H., A History of Esthetics 79
- Gilman, W. E., Milton's Rhetoric 636
- Gladding, E. B., Housman's *More Poems*, VII and Dehmel's *Trost* 215, Johann Georg Jacobi's *Die Winterreise* 66
- Glasheen, F. J., Shelley's Use of Gray's Poetry 192
- Gordon, I. A., Three New Letters of Matthew Arnold 552
- Graham, C. B., The Jonsonian Tradition in the Comedies of John Dennis 370
- Graham, P. and Jones, J., A Concordance to the Poems of Sidney Lanier 396.
- Green, H. J., Fromont, a Traitor in the *Chansons de geste* 329
- Greg, W. W., The Variants in the First Quarto of *King Lear* 624
- Griffin, C. M., Henry Blake Fuller 67.
- Griffin, M. I. J., Frank R. Stockton 67.
- Groom, B., On the Diction of Tennyson, Browning, and Arnold 378
- Grubb, G. G., On the Serial Publication of *Oliver Twist* 290
- Haight, G. S., George Eliot and John Chapman 559
- Hall, R. A., Jr., The Silk Factory in Chrestien de Troyes' *Yvain* 418.
- Halstead, W. L., New Source Influence on *The Shoemaker's Holiday* 127.
- Ham, E. B., An Eighth *Vengeance Alixandre* 409.
- Hamilton, D. L., The Composition of Anatole France's *l'Orme du mail* 245
- Hanford, J. H. (ed.), A Milton Handbook 392
- Harbage, A., Annals of English Drama, 975-1700 561
- Harris, J. W., John Bale 561
- Harrison, T. P., Jr. (ed.) and Leon, H. J. (tr.), The Pastoral Elegy 242
- Havens, G. R., The Conclusion of Voltaire's *Poème sur le désastre de Lisbonne* 422
- Hawkins, R. L., Positivism in the U S (1853-1861) 320.
- Hayakawa, S. I., Jones, H. M., and Clark, H. H. (eds.), Oliver Wendell Holmes 156
- Heffner, R. M. S., Zum Leich Walthers von der Vogelweide 54
- Heltzel, V. B. and Hudson, H. H. (eds. and trs.), Thomas Moffet, *Nobilis, or, a View of the Life and Death of a Sidney*, and Lessus *Lugubris* 628
- Henkin, L. J., The Apocrypha and Chaucer's *House of Fame* 583
- Herron, I. H., The Small Town in American Literature 302
- Higby, C. P. and Schantz, B. T. (eds.), John Lothrop Motley 156
- Hillmann, M. V., *Pearl*: 'Inlyche' and 'Rearde' 457
- Holbrook, W. C., The Adjective *gothique* in the 18th Century 498
- Holmes, J., The Poet's Work 79
- Howard, E. J. (ed.), Sir Thomas Elyot's *The Defence of Good Women* 620
- Howes, R. F., see Armour, R. W.
- Hudson, H. H., see Heltzel, V. B.
- Hummel, R. O., Jr., 17th Century Publishing Economy 61
- Hutton, J., Malherbe, Saint Gelay, Tabourot, Théophile, and the *Jardin des Muses* 492
- Irwin, W. R., An Attack on John Fielding 523
- Jensen, G. E., The Life and Letters of Henry Cuyler Bunner 400
- Jessen, M. R., Kurzform und Langform bei Adalbert Stifter 430
- Jones, H. M., see Hayakawa, S. I.
- Jones, J., see Graham, P.

- Kaplan, E., Philosophy in the Poetry of E. A. Robinson 317
- Karstien, C., Historische deutsche Grammatik 157
- Kaufmann, F. W., German Dramatists of the 19th Century 557
- Keefer, L., Pushkin and Goethe 24
- Kinne, W. A., Revivals and Importations of French Comedies in England, 1749-1800 305
- Kirby, T. A., Chaucer's *Troilus* 300
- Koch, M. P., An Analysis of the Long Prayers in O F Literature 402
- Krappe, A. H., An Oriental Theme in the *Friðþjófs Saga* 454
- Krogmann, W. (ed.), *Das Redentiner Osterspiel* 474
- Kuethe, J. L., Mechanical Features of a 17th Century Submarine 202
- Kurrelmeyer, W., German Lexicography 14, Ein unbekannter Brief Lenzens an Boie 445.
- Lang, V., The Character in the Elia Essays 374
- Larrabee, S. A., Byron's Return from Greece 618; The "Closet" and the "Stage" in 1759 282
- Leishman, J. B. and Spender, S. (trs.), Rainer Maria Rilke. *Dumò Elogies* 155
- Leon, H. J., see Harrison, T. P., Jr
- LeSage, L., The Chiché Basis for Some of the Metaphors of Jean Giraudoux 435
- Lewis, W. S. and Smith, W. H. (eds.), The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence, Vols III-VIII 310
- Livingston, C. H., O F *assiet* 414
- Logan, E. (ed.), A Concordance to the Poetry of S. T. Coleridge 396
- Lowery, M. R., Windows of the Morning 314.
- Lowry, H. F., see Tinker, C. B.
- Lucas, F. L., Ten Victorian Poets 479
- Lucken, L. U., *Antichrist* and the *Prophets of Antichrist* in the Chester Cycle 620
- Lumiansky, R. M., A Note on Blair's Edition of *The Unhappy Favourite* 280
- Lynch, J. J., Macduff, Not Macbeth 603.
- MacDavid, R. I., Jr., *Ivanhoe* and Simms' *Vasconcelos* 294.
- Macdonald, H., John Dryden 74
- McEuen, K. A., Classical Influence upon the Tribe of Ben 241
- McKee, D. R., Lahontan and Critical Deism 522
- McKee, K. N., Voltaire's *Brutus* during the French Revolution 100
- Malkiel, Y., A Lexicographic Mirage 34
- Malmberg, B. (ed.), *Le Roman du comte de Pontiers* 469
- Malone, K., Hygd 356
- Martz, L. L., Tobias Smollett and the *Universal History* 1.
- Mathews, E. G., Gil Polo, Desportes, and Lyly's "Cupid and My Campaspe" 606, John Donne's "Little Rag" 607.
- Maxwell, B., Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger 144
- Mersand, J., Traditions in American Literature 319
- Metcalf, J. C., De Quincey 378
- Miller, P., The New England Mind 302
- Miller, W. H., The Authorship of *A General View of the Stage* 612
- Mizener, A., "Though, Phyllis, your prevailing charms" 529
- Morrisette, B. A., Mlle Desjardins and the "Apologie du luxe" 209
- Murrie, E. B., see Day, C. L.
- Nelson, J. S. (tr.), *Aeneae Silvii de Liberatorum Educatione* 160
- Nethercot, A. H., The Road to Tryermaine 381
- Nicolson, M. (ed.), Captain Samuel Brunt, *A Voyage to Cacklogallima* 158
- Niemeyer, C., A Misdating of "A Ballade upon a Wedding" 368
- Nitchie, E., The Reverend Colonel Finch 638
- Nitze, W. A., Arthurian Romance and Modern Poetry and Music 481, "Or est venuz qui aunera" a Medieval Dictum 405
- Nolte, F. O., Lessing's *Laokoon* 635
- Norton, M. D. H. (tr.), Translations from the Poetry of Rainer Maria Rilke 153
- Notopoulos, J. A., Notes on the Text of Shelley's Translations from Plato 536.
- Oake, R. B., Diderot and Donne's BIAΘANATΩZ 114.

- O'dell, G C D, *Annals of the New York Stage*, Vol. XII 639
- O'Neill, E H, *Biography by Americans 1658-1936* 637
- Pace, G. B, Sir Thomas Elyot against Poetry 597
- Painter, S, *French Chivalry* 482
- Pascal, R (ed.), *Shakespeare in Germany 1740-1815* 385
- Patch, H R, *On Rereading Chaucer*, 69
- Paulsen, W, *Friedrich Schlegels Alarcos und die Umbildung der Fruhromantik* 513
- Peacock, R, *Holderlin* 230
- Peery, W, *A Metrical Puzzle in the Mirror for Magistrates* 258
- Pendell, W D, *The London Merchant and Le Mierre's Barnevelt* 432
- Petersen, J., *Geschichtsdrama und nationaler Mythos* 152.
- Pettit, H, *Coleridge's Mount Abora* 376
- Piercy, J. K, *Studies in Literary Types in 17th Century America (1607-1710)* 79.
- Pitcher, S M, *Some Observations on the 1663 Edition of Faustus* 588
- Pottle, F A, *The Dark Hints of Sir John Hawkins and Boswell* 325
- Powell, W C, *A Note on the Stage History of Beaumont and Fletcher's Love's Pilgrimage and The Chances* 122
- Power, J, *Shelley in America in the 19th Century* 638
- Privitera, J F, *The Sources of Thomas Corneille's Comtesse d'Orgueil* 211.
- Pronger, L J, *Marmontel as a Source of Stendhal* 433.
- Quiller-Couch, A. (ed.), *The New Oxford Book of English Verse* 478.
- Read, W. A, *Botango, an English Ghost-Word* 65.
- Rees, G, *Remy de Gourmont* 466
- Reichart, W. A, *Hauptmann's "So lange Gott nimmt, nehm ich auch"* 447
- Remak, H H H., *Voltaire à d'Argental (juillet 1759)* 504.
- Rich, T, *Harington and Ariosto* 620.
- Rives, L, *Charles Reade* 313; *It's Never Too Late to Mend*, an ed. of Charles Reade's unpublished Drama 313
- Rix, H D, *Rhetoric in Spenser's Poetry* 620
- Robertson, D W, *Sidney's Metaphor of the Ulcer* 56
- Rosenhaupt, H W, *Der deutsche Dichter um die Jahrhundertwende und seine Abgelosheit von der Gesellschaft* 75
- Rugoff, M A, *Donne's Imagery* 626
- Runyan, H J., *An Emendation to A E Housman's Translation from Euripides' Alceste (962-1005)* 458
- Ryan, A. M, *A Map of Old English Monasteries* 306
- Sahlin, M. *Etude sur la carole médiévale* 222
- Sams, H W, *The Dual Time-Scheme in Chaucer's Troilus* 94
- Sanderlin, G, *The Character "Liberum Arbitrium" in the C-Text of Piers Plowman* 449
- Schaffer, A, *A Breton Romanticist, Mme Auguste Penquer* 541
- Schantz, B T., see Higby, C P
- Schreiber, C F (ed.), *Goethe's Works with the exception of Faust . . . biographical sketch of W A. Speck* 297
- Schutz, A H, *Auzels Cassadors*, V 2334 429
- Scott-Thomas, H. F., *Nahum Tate, Laureate Two Biographical Notes* 611
- Sehrt, E H, *Urfaust Line* 308 483.
- Shanley, J L., *A Study of Spenser's Gentleman* 620.
- Sharp, R L, *From Donne to Dryden* 312
- Sherwin, R T, *The Viking and the Red Man* 243
- Shudofsky, M. M, *An Early 18th Century Rhymed Paraphrase of Paradise Lost*, II, 1-225 133
- Siegel, P, *"A Paradise within Thee" in Milton, Byron, and Shelley* 615.
- Silin, C. I, *Benserade and his Ballets de cour* 555
- Simmons, E J, *Dostoevski, the Making of a Novelist* 463
- Singleton, C. S (ed.), *Nuovi canti carnascialeschi del Rinascimento* 72
- Sisson, C. J, *The Judicious Marriage of Mr. Hooker and the Birth of*

- The Laus of Ecclesiastical Polity* 631
- Sleeth, C R, The Friendship of Chaucer's Summoner and Pardoner 138
- Smith, M B, Marlowe's Imagery and the Marlowe Canon 620.
- Smith, W H, see Lewis, W. S.
- Smyser, H M, Chaucer's Two-Mile Pilgrimage 205.
- Speck, W A, see Schreiber, C F.
- Spencer, H, Macduff, Not Macbeth 604
- Spender, Stephen, see Leishman, J B
- Spitzer, L, *Binôme* 426; *Glose socio-linguistique sur un usage de se défendre* 81; *Locomotive et automobile* 403; *Le Poêle de Descartes* 110; *Scorsonère, 'salsifs noir'* 243
- Stern, B H, The Rise of Romantic Hellenism in English Literature, 1732-1786 237
- Stewart, B T, A Borrowing from Spenser by Phineas Fletcher 273
- Strathmann, E A, The Textual Evidence for "The School of Night" 176.
- Sullivan, F., Cyme, a Purgative Drug 263.
- Summers, M., Aphra Behn and Montfleury 562, The Gothic Quest 561,
- Tatlock, J S. P., Is Chaucer's Monk a Monk? 80; see also 161.
- Templeman, W., The Life and Work of William Gilpin 147.
- Thomas, S, The Elizabethan Idea of Melancholy 261.
- Tindall, W Y, D H. Lawrence and Susan his Cow 388.
- Tinker, C B, Painter and Poet 236; — and Lowry, H F, The Poetry of Matthew Arnold 633
- Tolles, W, Tom Taylor and the Victorian Drama 476
- Trahard, P., Le Mystère poétique 464
- Utley, F. L., The Last of the Miller's Head? 534
- Valency, M. J., The Tragedies of Herod and Mariamne 151.
- Van Doren, C, The American Novel 308.
- Viens, C P, An Exchange of Notes over George Sand 548.
- Walker, T C, A Note on Chateaubriand's Documentary Accuracy 217
- Walz, J A, *Urfaust* 90, see also 483
- Wardle, R M, The Authorship of *Whitchall* (1827) 207.
- Warren, A, Richard Crashaw 471
- Wasserman, E R, Moses Browne and the 1783 Edition of Giles and Phineas Fletcher 288
- Watkins, W B C, Perilous Balance 394
- Webb, H J, The Elizabethan Translation of Vegetius' *De Re Militari* 605
- Weber, C J, Hardy of Wessex 308
- Wecter, D, Dr. Johnson, Mrs Thrale, and Boswell 525.
- Weigand, H J, A "Falsified Verse" in Kleist's *Homburg?* 321
- Weihe, A, Der junge Eichendorff und Novalis' *Naturpantheismus* 161.
- Whitfield, I T (ed.), Louisiana French Folk Songs 481
- Whiting, G W, Milton's Literary Milieu 392.
- Wilson, E C, England's Eliza 234
- Wilson, J H, Rochester's "Buffoon Conceit" 372
- Wilson, R M, Early Middle English Literature 218
- Wolfe, D M, Lalburne's Note on Milton 360.
- Wolff, H M, Zur Bedeutung Batteux's fur Lenz 508
- Woodbridge, B. M., Rousseau and *Faust* 324
- Woolf, H. B, The Old Germanic Principles of Name-Giving 390
- Worcester, D, The Art of Satire 318
- Workman, S K, Versions by Skelton, Caxton, and Berners of a Prologue by Diodorus Siculus 252.
- Wright, L B, The First Gentlemen of Virginia 316; — (ed), Letters of Robert Carter 240.
- Young, G. M., The Age of Tennyson 378.
- Zarncke, see Bluhm, H.

REVIEWERS

- Abernethy, T P · L B Wright, The First Gentlemen of Virginia 316
- Allen, D C L Bradner, Musae Anglicanae 628, V B Heltzel and H H Hudson (eds and trs), Thomas Moffet, *Nobilis; or, a View of the Life and Death of a Sidney*, and *Lessus Lugubris* 628; K A McEuen, Classical Influence upon the Tribe of Ben 241, W Ringler (ed) and W Allen, Jr. (tr) John Rainolds, *Oratio in Laudem Artis Poeticae* 628
- Avery, E L W A Kinne, Revivals and Importations of French Comedies in England, 1749-1800 305
- Baugh, A C · R M Wilson, Early Middle English Literature 218
- Beach, J. W C van Doren, The American Novel 308, C J Weber, Hardy of Wessex 308
- Berend, E : K Berger, Jean Paul 228
- Blackmur, R P C Brooks, Modern Poetry and the Tradition 388, W Y Tindall, D H Lawrence and Susan his Cow 388
- Boas, G A H Gilbert, Literary Criticism 560, K E Gilbert and H Kuhn, A History of Esthetics 79
- Bradner, L M C Boyd, Elizabethan Music and Musical Criticism 242
- Brooks, C · A Quiller-Couch (ed), The New Oxford Book of English Verse 478
- Brown, A C L · W A. Nitze, Arthurian Romance and Modern Poetry and Music 481.
- Brown, H · B Fay, Civilisation américaine 302, I H Herron, The Small Town in American Literature 302; P Miller, The New England Mind 302
- Bushnell, N S : H W. Garrod, Keats 159
- Campbell, O J · D Worcester, The Art of Satire 318.
- Cooper, L H Eigerman (ed), The Poetry of Dorothy Wordsworth 636, P Graham and J Jones, A Concordance to the Poems of Sidney Lanier 396, E. Logan (ed.), A Concordance to the Poetry of S T Coleridge 396
- Dieckmann, H · F J Crowley (ed), Voltane's *Poème sur la loi naturelle* 233
- Ditchy, J K : I T Whitfield (ed), Louisiana French Folk Songs 481.
- Eaton, H. A · E K Chambeis (ed), Arnold 378, B Groom, On the Diction of Tennyson, Browning, and Arnold 378, J. C Metcalf, De Quincey 378, G M Young, The Age of Tennyson 378
- Eddy, W A M Nicolson (ed), Captain Samuel Brunt, *A Voyage to Cacklogallina* 158
- Einarsson, S R T Sherwin, The Viking and the Red Man 243
- Fagin, N B · J Mersand, Traditions in American Literature 319; G C D Odell, Annals of the New York Stage, Vol XII 639
- Feise, E J B Leishman and S Spender (trs), Rainer Maria Rilke *Dunno Elegies* 155, M D H Norton (tr), Translations from the Poetry of Rainer Maria Rilke 155; A Weihe, Der junge Eichendorff und Novalis' Naturpantheismus 161.
- Gilbert, A H · C S Baldwin and D. L. Clark (ed), Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice 149; J S Nelson (tr), *Aeneas Silvii de Liberorum Educatione* 160, C S Singleton (ed), Nuovi canti carnascialeschi del Rinascimento 72
- Haller, W : W E Gilman, Milton's Rhetoric 636
- Harrold, C F C. B Tinker and H F Lowry, The Poetry of Matthew Arnold 633.
- Hill, C J · W Templeman, The Life and Work of William Gilpin 147
- Hillebrand, H. N. H Buchan (ed.), The Poems of Thomas Pestell 620; H B Charlton, *Romeo and Juliet* as an Experimental Tragedy 620; B. Coles, Shakespeare Studies

- Julius Caesar* 620, R B Daniels, Some 17th Century Worthies in a 20th Century Mirror 620, H Frenz, Die Entwicklung des sozialen Dramas in England vor Galsworthy 620, R Fricker, Das historische Drama in England von der Romantik bis zur Gegenwart 620, E. J. Howard (ed.), Sir Thomas Elyot's *The Defence of Good Women* 620, L U Lucken, *Antichrist* and the *Prophets of Antichrist* in the Chester Cycle 620, T Rich, Harington and Ariosto 620; H D Rix, Rhetoric in Spenser's Poetry 620, J L Shanley, A Study of Spenser's Gentleman 620, M. B. Smith, Marlowe's Imagery and the Marlowe Canon 620
- Hooker, E N and Swedenberg, H T, Jr H Macdonald, John Dryden 74
- Hornberger, T. M E. Clark, Peter Porcupine in America 320
- Howard, L J K Piercy, Studies in Literary Types in 17th Century America (1607-1710) 79.
- Howe, M A. De W. S. I Hayakawa, H. M. Jones, and H. H. Clark (eds), Oliver Wendell Holmes 156, C. P. Higby and B. T. Schantz (eds), John Lothrop Motley 156
- Hughes, M. Y.: C J Sisson, The Judicious Marriage of Mr Hooker and the Birth of *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* 631
- Hutcheson, H H. L B Wright (ed), Letters of Robert Carter 240.
- Jones, F. L. E Nitchie, The Reverend Colonel Finch 638
- Jones, H. M. G Boas (ed), Romanticism in America 477.
- Kaufmann, F W: C K Bang. Maske und Gesicht in den Werken Conrad Ferdinand Meyers 473; F Bielfeldt, Hebbels Menschengestaltung als dichterischer Ausdruck nordisch-deutschen Wesens 153; H. W. Rosenhaupt, Der deutsche Dichter um die Jahrhundertwende und seine Abgelostheit von der Gesellschaft 75.
- Kies, P. P. H Arneke, Kirchengeschichte und Rechtsgeschichte in England 385; P W. Biesterfeldt, Die dramatische Technik Thomas Kyds 385; M Deutschbein, Shakespeare's *Macbeth* als Drama des Barock 385, R Pascal (ed), Shakespeare in Germany 1740-1815 385.
- Kirby, T A S Painter, French Chivalry 482
- Kirschbaum, L W W. Greg, The Variants in the First Quarto of *King Lear* 624
- Kitchel, A T G. S Haight, George Eliot and John Chapman 559.
- Koenig, F B Malmberg (ed), *Le Roman du comte de Poitiers* 469
- Kurrelmeyer, W C F. Schreiber (ed), Goethe's Works with the exception of *Faust* 297.
- Lancaster, H. C.: P A Chapman, The Spirit of Molière 150
- Lange, V.: R. Peacock, Holderlin 230
- Larrabee, S. A.: B H Stern, The Rise of Romantic Hellenism in English Literature, 1732-1786 237.
- McElderry, B. R., Jr.: D. C. Bryant, Edmund Burke and his Literary Friends 479
- McManaway, J G: C. L. Day and E B Murrie, English Song-Books 630; B Maxwell, Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger 144
- Magoun, F P. A M Ryan, A Map of Old English Monasteries 306
- Malone, K. F Brie, Die nationale Literatur Schottlands von den Anfängen bis zur Renaissance 78; H M and N K Chadwick, The Growth of Literature 401
- Manning, C. A E J Simmons, Dostoevski, the Making of a Novelist 463
- Manwaring, E W K. G Dapp, George Keate 398
- Marckwardt, A H H B Woolf, The Old Germanic Principles of Name-Giving 390
- Mayo, B E H O'Neill, Biography by Americans 1658-1936 637
- Miles, L W F L Lucas, Ten Victorian Poets 479
- Morrisette, B. A G. Rees, Remy de Gourmont 466.

- Neill, K · E C Wilson, England's Eliza 234
- Nitchie, E E Kaplan, Philosophy in the Poetry of E A Robinson 317
- Nitze, W A M Bishop, Ronsard Prince of Poets 231
- Oates, W J · L Cooper, Aristotelian Papers 77
- Parker, W R · J M French, Milton in Chancery 392; J H Hanford (ed), A Milton Handbook 392, G W Whiting, Milton's Literary Milieu 392
- Parmenter, M T P Harrison, Jr (ed) and H J Leon (tr), The Pastoral Elegy 242
- Pariott, T M F S Boas, Christopher Marlowe 141
- Paulsen, W F W Kaufmann, German Dramatists of the 19th Century 557
- Peircival, M O M R Lowery, Windows of the Morning 314
- Periy, H Ten E M J Valency, The Tragedies of Herod and Mariamne 151
- Pochmann, H A · A B Faust (ed), J Q Adams (tr), Wieland, *Oberon* 225
- Porterfield, A W · E Baldauf, Die Syntax des Komparativs im Gotischen, Althochdeutschen, und Altsächsischen 480
- Pottle, F A W B C. Watkins, Perilous Balance 394
- Praz, M A H Nethercot, The Road to Tryermaine 381
- Quintana, R H N Fairchild, Religious Trends in English Poetry 146
- Raysor, T M · R W Armour and R F Howes (eds), Coleridge the Talker 472
- Root, R K T A Kirby, Chaucer's *Troilus* 300, W S Lewis and W H Smith (eds), The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence Vols III-VIII 310.
- Ruud, M B H R Patch, On Re-reading Chaucer 69.
- Salinas, P A Alonso, Poesía y estilo de Pablo Neruda 459
- Schinz, A P Trahard, Le Mystère poétique 464
- Searles, C C I Silin, Benserade and his *Ballets de cour* 555
- Sehrt, E H C Karstien, Historische deutsche Grammatik 157.
- Shafer, R · G R Elliott, Humanism and Imagination 309, R L Hawkins, Positivism in the U S (1853-1861) 320, C B Tinker, Painter and Poet 236
- Spencer, H A J Armstrong (ed), Letters of Nicholas Vachel Lindsay to A J Armstrong 483; B H Clark (ed), America's Lost Plays 475, 639, S B Ewing, Burtonian Melancholy in the Plays of John Ford 482, A Harbage, Annals of English Drama, 975-1700 561; J W Harris, John Bale 561, W. Tolles, Tom Taylor and the Victorian Drama 476
- Spitzer, L · M P Koch, An Analysis of the Long Prayers in O F Literature 402, M Sahlén, Etude sur la carole médiévale 222
- Spivey, H E G E Jensen, The Life and Letters of Henry Cuyler Bunner 400
- Swedenberg, H T, Jr, see Hooker, E N.
- Teeter, L · J Holmes, The Poet's Work 79
- Thompson, S C F Fiske, Epic Suggestion in the Imagery of the Waverley Novels 239
- Troxell, J C P F Baum (ed), Letters of Dante Gabriel Rossetti to Fanny Cornforth 399
- Turner, A M L Rives, Charles Reade 313, L Rives (ed), Charles Reade, *It's Never Too Late to Mend* 313
- Warfel, H. R: M A Bennett, Elizabeth Stuart Phelps 67, R E Blanc, James McHenry 67, B Faust, Hawthorne's Contemporaneous Reputation 67, C M Griffin, Henry Blake Fuller 67, M I J Griffin, Frank R Stockton 67.

- | | |
|---|--|
| Warren, A · R · L Sharp, From
Donne to Dryden 312 | Wolff, H M · F O Nolte, Lessing's
<i>Laokoon</i> 635 |
| White, H C · A. Warlen, Richard
Crashaw 471 | |
| White, N I · J Power, Shelley in
America in the 19th Century 638 | Zucker, A E · W Krogmann (ed),
<i>Das Redentiner Osterspiel</i> 474, J |
| Williamson, G M A Rugoff,
Donne's Imagery 626 | Petersen, Geschichts-drama und
nationaler Mythos 152 |

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The English list includes only books received]

Baylor Bulletin, xlv, 3. — Baylor's old yellow manuscripts, containing "The conversation of Marquis Francesco Azzolini with Gio Lodovico Francia," transl J E Shaw, "The ill-fated good fortune of Francesco Canonici, called Mascambruni," transl B Corrigan, an introductory essay by W. O Raymond Waco, Texas: Baylor U, 1941 Pp xiv + 85 (Baylor University's Brown- ing Publications, series 12.)

Bronte, Emily Jane. — The complete poems Edited from the manuscripts by C W Hat- field New York Columbia U Press, 1941. Pp xxiv + 262 \$2 80

Browning, Robert. — Poetry and prose With introduction and notes by Sir Hum- phrey Milford, appreciations by Landor, Bagehot, Swinburne, Henry James, Saints- bury, and F L Lucas Oxford: Clarendon Press [New York Oxford U Press], 1941 Pp xxxii + 203 (Clarendon Series of Eng- lish Literature, 25)

Clark, Eleanor Grace. — Raleigh and Mar- lowe, a study in Elizabethan fustian New York: Fordham U Press, 1941. Pp x + 488 \$4 00

Hawthorne, Nathaniel — The English note- books Based upon the original manuscripts in Pierpont Morgan Library, and edited by Randall Stewart New York: Modern Lan- guage Association, 1941 Pp xlv + 667. \$6 00 (MLA, General Series, xiii)

Irwin, William Robert. — The making of Jonathan Wild, a study in the literary method of Henry Fielding. New York: Columbia U. Press, 1941 Pp x + 156 \$2 00 (Columbia U Studies in Eng and Comp Lit, 153)

Kelley, Maurice. — This great argument, a study of Milton's *De Doctrina Christiana* as a gloss upon *Paradise Lost* Princeton, N J: Princeton U Press, 1941 Pp xiv + 269 \$5 00 (Princeton Studies in English, 22)

Legge, M. Dominica (ed.). — Anglo-Norman letters and petitions from All Souls MS 182 Oxford: Basil Blackwell for Anglo- Norman Text Society, 1941 Pp xxiv + 495 £3 3. 0 (Anglo-Norman Texts, iii)

Lewis, Wilmarth Sheldon. — Three tours through London in the years 1748, 1776, 1797 New Haven, Conn: Yale U Press, 1941. Pp xii + 135. \$2 50 (Colver Lec- tures, Brown University, 21)

Maxwell, Baldwin, Briggs, W. D, Johnson, Francis R., and Thompson, E. N. S. (eds.). —

Renaissance studies in honor of Hardin Craig Stanford U, Calif. Stanford U. Press, [1941] Pp viii + 339 \$3 50

Shine, Hill. — Carlyle and the Saint- Simonians, the concept of historical peri- odicity Baltimore, Md: Johns Hopkins Press, 1941 Pp xiv + 191 \$2 25

Weber, Kurt. — Lucius Cary, second Vis- count Falkland New York: Columbia U. Press, 1940 Pp xvi + 360 \$3 00 (Columbia U Studies in Eng and Comp Lit, 147.)

Wright, Louis B. and Tinsling, Marion (eds.) — The secret diary of William Byrd of Westover, 1709-1712 Richmond, Va: Dietz Press, 1941 Pp. xxx + 622 \$5 00

GERMAN

Altdeutsches Wort und Wortkunstwerk Georg Baeseke zum 65 Geburtstag, 13 Januar 1941 Halle: Niemeyer, 1941 iv, 213 pp M 13

Appel, Elisabeth — Vom Fehlen des Genitiv- s [Arbeiten zur Entwicklungspsychologie 21] München: C H. Beck, 1941 131 pp M 7 20

Arndt, Karl J — Herder and the Harmony Society [Reprinted from the *Germanic Re- view*, Vol XVI, No 2, April 1941] Pp 108-113.

— The Genesis of Germantown, Louisi- ana: or the mysterious past of Louisiana's mystic, Count de Leon. [Reprinted from the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, Vol 24, No 2, April, 1941]. 58 pp

Barnstein, Aenne — Die Darstellungen der hofischen Verkleidungsspiele im ausgehenden Mittelalter Diss München *Würzburg- Anmühle*: K Triltsch, 1940. 76 pp

Baumgart, Wolfgang. — Goethe und Schle- sien [Schlesienbandchen 14] Breslau: Schlesien-Verl. 1940. 68 pp, 7 plates 80 Pf

Becher, Georg. — Schillers Wallenstein in wahrer Gestalt als Lösung des Wallenstein- Ratsels München: Becher-Verl. 1940. xii, 115 pp. M 7 50.

— Goethes wahre Faust-Form als Lösung des Faust-Ratsels München: Becher-Verl. 1940 112 pp M 4 80

Behr, Bruno. — Oberländische Flurnamen. [Flurnamen des Landkreises Schleiz]. Zeulenroda. Oberreuter, 1940. 112 pp. M 2 80

Beissner, Friedrich. — Geschichte der deut- schen Elegie [Grundriss d germ Philologie, 14] Berlin: de Gruyter, 1941. xii, 246 pp M. 10 50.

Belfrage, Sixten. — Die Entstehung der freien Rhythmen. [Aus. K. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundets i Lund Årsberättelse 1940-1941, I]. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1941. 26 pp.

Beyerlein, Franz Adam, zum 70 Geburtstag am 22. März 1941. Gewidmet von seinen Freunden [Hrsg. von Valerian Tornius]. Leipzig: Bohn [1941]. 56 pp. 1000 copies.

Bluntschli, Marie—Erinnerungen an Gottfried Keller [Erweitert aus: Der Bund Jg 91]. Bern: Francke [1940]. 30 pp. Fr. 2.

Carmina Burana. Mit Benutzung der Vorarbeiten Wilhelm Meyers kritisch hrsg. von Alfons Hilka u. Otto Schumann. Bd. 1 Text, Bd. 2 Die Liebeslieder. Hrsg. von Otto Schumann. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1941. xvi, 315 pp. M. 20.

Ehlinger, Heinrich.—Geschichtliche deutsche Lautlehre übersichtlich dargestellt. München: Hueber, 1941. 42 pp. M. 1.60.

Fassbinder, Joseph—Heinrich von Kleist, die Hermannsschlacht [Wege zu Dichtern und ihren Werken. H. 2]. Paderborn: Schöningh [1941]. 47 pp. 65 Pf.

Fechter, Paul.—Geschichte der deutschen Literatur. Von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. Mit 500 Abbildungen im Text u. 8 farbigen Tafeln. Berlin: Knauer [1941]. 815 pp. M. 6.50.

Gitschmann, Gerhard.—Samuel Gottheb Burde (1753-1831). Ein Beitrag zur schlesischen Literaturgeschichte. Diss. Breslau: Pischke, 1941. 130 pp.

Goethe. Alles um Liebe. Goethes Briefe aus der 1. Hälfte s. Lebens (Hrsg. u. mit lebensgeschichtlichen Verbindungen versehen von Ernst Hartung). Berlin: Deutsche Buch-Gemeinschaft [1941]. 449 pp.

Goethe. Vom tätigen Leben Goethes. Briefe aus d. 2. Hälfte s. Lebens (Hrsg. u. mit lebensgeschichtlichen Verbindungen versehen von Ernst Hartung). Berlin: Deutsche Buch-Gemeinschaft [1941]. 538 pp.

Goethe's Poems, Edited with an Introduction, Notes, and a Vocabulary by Clarence Willis Eastman. New York: F. S. Crofts & Co., 1941. xxviii, 231 pp. \$1.60.

Haager Liederhandschrift, Die. Faksimile des Originals mit Einl. u. Transskription. Hrsg. v. E. F. Kossmann. Haag: Nijhoff, 1940. 140 pp., 69 plates, 4°. Fl. 42.

Hagboldt, Peter.—Graded German Readers, Books Eleven to Thirteen. [The Heath-Chicago German Series]. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. [1941]. vi, 56, iv, 58; vi, 56 pp. \$1.20.

—Pechvogel and Gluckskind. Retold and Edited after the German of Richard von Volkmann-Leander. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. [1941]. v, 50 pp. \$0.28.

Haller, Rudolf.—Die Romantik in der Zeit der Umkehr. Die Anfänge der jüngeren Romantik 1800-1808. [Habilitationsschrift. Tübingen]. Bonn: Rohrscheid, 1941. 264 pp. M. 9.60.

Hartmann von Aue.—Der arme Heinrich, a Poem. The critical text of Erich Gierach with introduction, notes and vocabulary by J. Knight Bostock. [German Mediaeval Series, Section A, Vol. 1]. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1941. 114 pp., 6 s.

Heller, Otto, assisted by **Theodore H. Leon**.—The Language of Charles Sealsfield. A Study in Atypical Usage. [Washington Univ. Studies, New Series, Language and Literature, No. 11]. St. Louis, 1941. xi, 154 pp.

Hildebrandt, Kurt.—Holderlin Philosophie und Dichtung [2. Aufl.]. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1940. viii, 290 pp. M. 9.60.

Hilgendorf, Walter.—Das Erlebnis der Arbeitslosigkeit in der deutschen Erzählkunst der Krisenzeit. Diss. [Dichtung, Wort u. Sprache. H. 9]. Hamburg: Hansischer Gildenverl. 1941. 50 pp. M. 2.50.

Holderlin, Friedrich.—Gesammelte Briefe. Eingeleitet von Ernst Bertram (6-8 Tsd.). Leipzig: Insel-Verl. [1941]. xxviii, 451 pp. M. 5.

Hoyer, Kurt.—Das Werden des Anhaltischen. Von der niedersächsisch-fränkischen Mischsprache zur mitteldeutschen Ausgleichsprache. [Dessau: 1941]. 29 pp.

Jahresgabe der Baumbach-Gemeinde Meinungen 1941. (Zusammengestellt u. hrsg. von Hugo Müller). [Meinungen]. Bruckner & Renner, 1941. 31 pp. 50 Pf.

Jilek, Heinrich.—Goethe und der slavische Sudosten [Veröffentlichungen d. Goethe-Ges., Ortsvereinigung Leipzig, H. 1, Aus Zeitschrift für deutsche Geisteswissenschaft. Jg. 3, H. 3]. Jena: Diederichs [1941]. 17 pp. 75 Pf.

Johnson, Gosta.—Der Lautstand in der Fohö-Ausgabe von Hans Sachs' Werken. Ein Beitrag zur Nürnberger Druckersprache des 16. Jhs. 1. Der Vokalismus. Diss. Uppsala: Appelberg, 1941. xvi, 275 pp.

Kirschweg, Johannes.—Bernard Wiemann. Saat u. Ernte [Schöpferische Niederdeutsche, 7]. Osnabrück: Fromm [1941]. 63 pp. M. 1.20.

Knapp, Eva Maria.—Margarete Lenk. Worte des Gedenkens zum 100. Geburtstag der Jugendschriftstellerin. Mit einem Portrait Margarete Lenks. Zwickau: Herrmann [1941]. 21 pp., 1 plate, 7 pp. 40 Pf.

Krüger, Herman Anders.—Wilhelm Raabe [Schöpferische Niederdeutsche, 2]. Osnabrück: Fromm [1941]. 80 pp. M. 1.20.

Kulp, Johannes.—Feldprediger und Kriegsteufel als Kirchenheddichter. [Welt des Gesangbuchs. H. 23]. Leipzig: Schloessmann [1941]. 40 pp. M. 1.60.

Marbach, Felix.—Isabelle Kaiser. Der Dichterin Leben und Werk. Diss. Freiburg. Rapperswil: Gallus-Verl. H. Berti & Co. [1940]. vi, 212 pp. 4 plates. Fr. 5.50.

Meise, Hildegard.—Die Gestalt der Königin Elisabeth von England in der deutschen Literatur Diss Greifswald *Drebkau, N.-L.* Leuschner, 1941. 113 pp

[Meyer, Friedrich].—Schillers Horen, als Verlagswerk betrachtet. Ein bibliographischer Bericht *Leipzig*. [A Meyer], 1941 64 pp., 150 numbered copies M 18.

Morgan, George Allen, Jr.—What Nietzsche means *Cambridge*. Harvard Univ. Press, 1941. xviii, 408 pp \$4 00

Müller, Joachim.—Natur und Wirklichkeit in der Dichtung der Annette von Droste-Hülshoff [Veröffentlichungen der Annette von Droste-Ges Bd 6] *Münster*. Aschen-dorff [1941] 123 pp M 4

Mulot, Arno.—Das Volk in der deutschen Dichtung unserer Zeit [= Mulot, Die deutsche Dichtung unserer Zeit T 2, Buch 2] *Stuttgart*: Metzler, 1941 vii, 82 pp M 2 85

Oehler, Helmut.—Prinz Eugen in Volkslied und Flugschrift Diss [Giessener Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie 77] *Giessen* von Münchow, 1941 139 pp M 8 50.

Petsch, Robert.—Einführung in Goethes Faust [Volksschriften der Hans Univ. H. 2]. *Hamburg*: Broschek [1941]. 92 pp. M 1 20.

Pretzel, Ulrich.—Fruhgeschichte des deutschen Reims Bd 1: Die Entwicklung bis zur Volltonigkeit des Reims Berliner Habilitationsschrift [Palaestra 220] *Leipzig*: Akad. Verlagsges 1941 vi, 272 pp M 26 20.

Pyrütz, Hans.—Goethe und Marianne von Willemer Eine biographische Studie Berlin, Habilitationsschrift. *Stuttgart*: Metzler, 1941 132 pp. M 5 80

Reinhart, Hans, in seinem Werk [Dem Dichter zum 60. Geburtstag 18 August 1940 .. dargebracht von Hermann Draber u. a.] *Zürich*. Fretz & Wasmuth [1941] 367 pp, 12 plates 4°. Fr 25

Riepe, Christian.—Eichendorffs Menschen-gestaltung [Neue deutsche Forschungen Abt Neuere deutsche Literaturgesch Bd 29] *Berlin*. Junker u Dunnhaupt, 1941 63 pp M. 2 80

Rink, Joseph.—Handel und Verkehr im Wortschatz der Koschneider [Koschneider-Bucher 29 S-A aus Deutsche Monatshefte, Jg 7, H. 7/8] *Posen* 1941 12 pp. M 1.

Sauer, August.—Grillparzers Gespräche und die Charakteristiken seiner Persönlichkeit durch die Zeitgenossen Ges u. hrsg. Neue Nachträge [Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Ges N F Bd. 1]. *Wien*: A Schroll & Co., 1941. xvi, 158 pp, 3 plates M 6.

Schadewaldt, Wolfgang.—Winckelmann und Homer. [Leipziger Universitätsreden, H. 6] *Leipzig*: J. A. Barth, 1941. 69 pp. M. 1.60.

Schlaf, Johannes.—Aus meinem Leben Erinnerungen Mit 20 Abbildungen [Hal-lische Nachrichten-Bucherei Bd. 29] *Halle*: Verl. d. Hallischen Nachrichten [1941]. 72 pp M. 1 20

Schmid, Gunther.—Goethe und die Naturwissenschaften. Eine Bibliographie. Hrsg. im Namen der Kaiserl Leopoldinisch-Carolinisch Deutschen Akademie der Naturforscher von Emil Abderhalden *Halle* Deu. Akad d Naturforscher, 1940. xv, 620 pp 4°. M. 60

Schmitz, Friedrich Joseph.—Lessings Stellung in der Entfaltung des Individualismus [Univ. of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol 23]. *Berkeley, Cal*: Univ of California Press, 1941. 152 pp.

Schmitz, Hans.—Blutsadel und Geistesadel in der hochhofschen Dichtung Diss. Bonn [Bonner Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie. H 11] *Wurzburg*: Triltsch, 1941 50 pp M 2 40

Schonder, Hermann.—Johann Elias Schlegel als Übergangsgestalt [Stadion Bd 7]. *Wurzburg*: Triltsch, 1941. 67 pp M 2 40

Schummer, Karl.—Wolfram von Eschenbach, Parzival [Wege zu Dichtern und ihren Werken H 3] *Paderborn*: Schöningh [1940] 47 pp 65 Pf.

Schulz, Walther.—Das Deutschlandbild in der französischen Kritik nach 1918. Diss Greifswald [Beiträge zur Sprach-, Stil- und Literaturforschung Abt Romanistik 6]. *Berlin*. Nicolai, 1941 79 pp M. 4 50.

Schwarz, Georg.—Uhland (1.-5. Tsd.). [Die Dichter der Deutschen Folge 4]. *Stuttgart*: Cotta [1940] 89 pp M 1 50.

Schwarz, Wolfgang.—Der Mythos des Junglingshaften in der deutschen Dichtung vom Ausgang des Naturalismus bis in unsere Zeit Diss. Breslau *Leipzig*: Haag-Drugulin, 1940 194 pp

Sedlag, Paul.—Die Erforschung der Ordnung des Lebendigen und die Bildung des Menschen (in Goethes naturwissenschaftlichen Schriften und im Wilhelm Meister) Diss. Berlin *Wurzburg*. Triltsch, 1940 49 pp M 2 70.

Seidel, Heinrich Wolfgang.—Theodor Fontane (1.-5. Tsd.). [Die Dichter der Deutschen Folge 4]. *Stuttgart*: Cotta [1940] 97 pp. M 1 50

Selk, Paul.—Die sprachlichen Verhältnisse im deutsch-danischen Sprachgebiet südlich der Grenze Ergänzungs-Band [Beiträge zur Heimatforschung H 4]. *Flensburg*: Verl Heimat u Erbe [1940] 28 pp. 1 plate, 5 maps M 3 60

Steffen, Albert.—Fruhrot der Mysterien-dichtung *Dornach*: Verl f. Schöne Wissen-schaften [1940] 203 pp. M 8.

Stichert, Friedrich—Studemund Namen-
studie *Hamburg Wandsbek* Fr Stichert
[1940] 23 typewritten pp, 4° M 5

Stolte, Heinz—Eilhart und Gottfried
Studie über Motivkreis und Aufbaustil Hab-
schrift, Jena (Sprache, Volkstum, Stil Bd
1), Halle: Niemeyer, 1941 168 pp, 2
plates M 8

Streissler, Friedrich—Deutsche Verslehre
Neubearb. Aufl. [Mimiatu-Bibl Nr 240/
241], Leipzig: Hothold [1941] 64 pp 40 Pf.

Wallner, Eduard—Gissubel und Ramsau
[Die Flurnamen Bayerns Reihe 9, H 2].
München Oldenbourg, 1940 45 pp, 3 plates
4° M 220

Wanner, Georg—Die Mundarten des Kan-
tons Schaffhausen Hrsg von Hans Wanner
Tl 2 [Schaffhausen, Kt Schule Jahresber-
icht 1941, Beilage] [Frauenfeld: Huber,
1941] Pp 85 227

Wegemann, G—Die Flurnamen Dith-
marschens [Die Sammlung der Flurnamen
Nordelbiens im Besitz der Schleswig-holst
Landesbibliothek zu Kiel, Bd 2] Kiel.
Muhlau, 1941 vi, 165 typewritten pp, 4°.
M 550

Wehring, Hans—Kolbenheyers Verhältnis
zum Drama mit Rücksicht auf seine philoso-
phische Weltanschauung Diss [Dichtung,
Wort u. Sprache H. 8] Hamburg: Han-
sischer Gildenverl 1941. 79 pp M. 330

Wehrle, Hugo—Deutscher Wortschatz.
Ein Wegweiser zum treffenden Ausdruck
A Schlessings "Passender Ausdruck" in
7. Aufl neu bearbeitet. Stuttgart: Klett,
1940 xxxi, 516 pp. M 11

Werner, Zacharias. Die Tagebucher des
Dichters Zacharias Werner. [Nur] Erläu-
terungen von Oswald Fleck [Bibl d. Literar
Vereins in Stuttgart, Publikation 290]
Leipzig: Hiersemann, 1940 325 pp M 15

Westerkamp, Ulrich—Beitrag zur Ge-
schichte des literarischen Philistertypus mit
besonderer Berücksichtigung von Brentanos
Philisterabhandlung Diss München [1941]
124 typewritten pp 4°.

Wilhelmi, Heinrich—Die Namen der Ge-
markung Giessen. [Hessisches Flurnamen-
buch. H 18] Diss Giessen. Marburg. El-
wert, 1940. 82 pp 1 plate M. 3

Willert, Paul—Deutsche Übersetzungen
des Walthariliedes, Scheffel, Winterfeld, Alt-
hof Diss. Jena: Thomas & Hubert, 1940.
87 pp.

Winkler, Karl—Literaturgeschichte des
oberpfälzisch-egerländischen Stammes. Bd. 1.
Literaturgeschichte Bd 2 Nordgaulesebuch
Kallmünz: Lassleben [1940]. ix, 711 pp.,
v, 371 pp. M. 15.

Wippermann, Ferdinand—Karl Wagen-
feld Ein Buchlein des Dankes und der

Verehrung [Schöpferische Niederdeutsche
6] Osnabrück Fromm [1941] 64 pp
M 120

Wirth, Werner—Der Schicksalsglaube in
den Isländersagas Eine religionsgeschicht-
lich philologische Untersuchung über Wesen
und Bedeutung der altgermanischen Vor-
stellungen von Schicksal und Glück [Ver-
öffentlichungen des Arischen Seminars H
1 = Veröffentlichungen des Orientalischen
Seminars d Univ Tübingen H 11] Stutt-
gart Kohlhammer, 1940 viii, 160 pp
M 750

Woelfle, A—Karte von Goethes Lebens-
reise 1749-1832 Mit 2 Nebenkarten u 6
Abbildungen München: Heimeran [1941]
46 5 x 59 cm M 5

Zwischen Minnesang und Volkslied Die
Lieder der Berliner Hs Germ Fol 922 Hrsg
von Margarete Lang Die Weisen Bearb v
Müller-Blattau [Studien zur Volkslied-
forschung H 1 = Jahrbuch f Volkslied-
forschung, Beiheft] Berlin de Gruyter,
1941 113 pp. M 12

FRENCH

Alfaric, P.—Les manuscrits de la "Vie de
Jésus" d'E. Renan Paris: Belles Lettres,
1939 (Pubs de l'Univ. de Strasbourg)

Aubrée, E.—Balzac à Fougères Paris:
Perrin, 1939

Bachelard, G.—Lautréamont Paris:
Corti, 1940.

Chaigne, L.—Anthologie de la Renaissance
catholique T. III Paris: Alsatia, 1940

Cinti, D.—Dizionario degli scrittori
francesi classici e moderni Milan Sonzogno,
1939 62 pp.

Dumbruch, E.—Held u Mutter in der
altfrz Dichtung des 11-13 Jahrh Münster
diss, 1939 89 pp

Dumesnil, R.—Chroniques, études, corre-
spondance de Guy de Maupassant Paris:
Gründ, 1940 xxv + 530 pp

Ferré, A.—Géographie de M Proust
Paris: Ed. du Sagittaire, 1939

Fosca, Fr.—E et J de Gourmont. Paris:
Michel, 1940.

Fourcassé, J.—Le romantisme et les
Pyrénées Paris Nouv Rev fr, 1940

Françon, Marcel—Guide bibliographique
pour servir à l'étude de l'hist litt en France
aux XIV^e et XV^e siècles. 1941 23 pp,
lithotyped, address author, Harvard U

Fromentin, E.—Les maîtres d'autrefois.
Paris. Garnier, 1939 432 pp

Hackett, C.-A.—Le lyrisme de Rimbaud.
Paris: Nizet et Bastard, 1939 234 pp

Labande, E.-R.—Etude sur Baudouin de
Sebourg, chanson de geste. Paris: Droz,
1939. 215 pp

Lalou, R.—Hist de la litt fr contemp
T II (1914-40) *Paris*. Presses Univ, 1940
582 pp

Levaillant, M.—Les poètes romantiques
Paris Delagrave, 1939

Maulnier, Th.—Lecture de Racine. *Paris*:
Nouv Rev fr, 1940

Mélanges A Duraffour. *Paris*. Droz, 1939.
xv + 276 pp

Meyer, W. F.—Der Einzelmensch u. die
Gesellschaft bei Zola. Münster diss., 1939
68 pp

Mondor, H.—L'amitié de Verlaine et
Mallarmé *Paris*. Nouv Rev fr, 1940.

— Vie de Mallarmé *Paris*. Gallimard,
1940 288 pp

Perdrizet, P.—Sur un vers de Baudelaire.
Paris. Geuthner, 1940 6 pp

Raymond, M.—De Baudelaire au sur-
réalisme 2^e éd. revue et aug *Paris*: Corti,
1940

Segond, J.—Psychologie de J Racine. *Paris*:
Belles Lettres, 1940

Stevens, L.-T.—La langue de Brantôme
Paris Nizet et Bastard, 1939 148 pp

Tableau de la litt. fr T I. De Corneille
à Chénier *Paris*: Nouv Rev fr, 1939.
500 pp

Tobler-Lommatzsch. — Altfranz Worter-
buch 22 Lieferung *Berlin* Weidmann,
1940 191 pp

Vauchelet.—Tous les patois des Ardennes
Gespunsart (Ardennes). Vauchelet, 1940.
300 pp

Walter, G.—André Chénier. Œuvres com-
plètes *Paris*: Bibl de la Pléiade, 1940
960 pp

ITALIAN

Barbadoro, F.—Il pensiero politico di F
de Sanctis *Roma*. Soc ed del libro ita-
liano, 1940 L 10.

Bizzarri, E.—Machiavelli anti-machiavellico.
Firenze La Nuova Italia, 1940.

Conferenze dantesche. A cura del comi-
tato milanese della Soc dantesca italiana.
Vol V. Studi su Dante. *Milano*: Hoepli,
1940. L 18

Ferretti, Giovanni. — Vita di Giacomo
Leopardi *Bologna*: Zanichelli, 1940. L 30

Ottokar, N.—Firenze Cenni di storia e
di cultura fiorentina *Firenze*: La Nuova
Italia, 1940.

Piattohi, Renato.—Il Codice diplomatico
dantesco *Firenze*: Gonnelli, 1940 L 125

Savino, E.—Ruggero Bonghi litterato.
Lecce. Tip ed. Salentina, 1940. L. 25.

Spini, Giorgio.—Tra rinascimento e riforma.
Antonio Brucioli. *Firenze*: La Nuova Italia,
1940.

Sticco, M.—Gli studi danteschi di G.
Rossetti *Milano*: Vita e Pensiero, 1940.
L 12

Traversi, C A.—La verità sul teatro ita-
liano dell' 800 *Udine*: Ist ediz accademiche,
1940 L 21

SPANISH

Abreu Gómez, E — Ruiz de Alarcón
Bibliog crit *Mexico*: Botas, 1939

Alonso, A & Henríquez Ureña, Pedro —
Gramática Castellana *Buenos Aires*. El
Ateneo, 1938 238 pp. \$4.00 arg

Anzoátegui, I. B. — Tres ensayos esp
Buenos Aires. Sol y Luna, 1938. 96 pp
\$3.00 arg

Aramon i Serra, R.—Cançoners dels Mas-
dovelles *Barcelona*. Inst d'Estudis Cata-
lans, 1938 xxxvi + 318 pp.

Austen, J.—The Story of Don Juan.
London: Secker, 1939 354 pp.

Babelon, J.—Cervantès *Paris*. Nouv Rev
Crit, 1939

Bastiani, R. & Laura B. de Molina y
Vedia — Literatura castellana *Buenos Aires*
Libr del Colegio, 1938 399 pp.

Benvenuto Murrieta, P. M.—El lenguaje
peruano I. *Lima*. Sanmartí, 1936 230 pp

Bertini, G M.—Fiore di romanze spagnole
Modena Tip Modenese, 1939 194 pp L 15

Biaggi, Z. & Sánchez y Escribano, F.—
Eng trans from the Sp, 1932 to April,
1938 *Stonington, Conn.* Stonington Pub
Co, 1939 18 pp \$0.50.

Calle Iturrino—Lope de Vega y clave de
Fuente Ovejuna. *Bilbao*: Dochao, 1939.
5 ptas

Cayuela, A. M. — Menéndez y Pelayo
orientador de la cultura española *Barcelona*
1939 403 pp.

Cervantes.—Don Chisciotte, ed G Bertoni
Modena. Tip Modenese, 1939 205 pp. L 15

— Entremeses Colección completa, ed
A G de Amezcua. *Buenos Aires*, 1939 224 pp.

Díaz & Díaz — Toponimia geográfica de la
provincia de San Juan *Mendoza*. Best, 1939
64 pp

Entrambasaguas, Joaquín de.—La deter-
minación del romanticismo español y otras
cosas *Barcelona*. Ed Apolo, 1939 192 pp

Espronceda.—Obras poéticas completas,
ed R de Villaluso *Buenos Aires*: Biblioteca
Mundial Sopena, 1939

Fernández-Guerra y Orbe, L.—Don Juan
Ruiz de Alarcón. Extracto con nuevos docu-
mentos y datos, ed. Teja y Zabre. *Mexico*:
Botas, 1939 195 pp.

Giusti, R F—Curso de lengua castellana.
III *Buenos Aires*: Ángel Estrada, 1939.
288 pp

Johnson, H. L.—An ed of *Triunfo de los santos* with a consideration of Jesuit school plays in Mexico before 1650 U of Pa. diss., 1941 179 pp

Laferrère, E.—Ortografía. El lenguaje gauchesco *Montevideo*: Monterde, 1938 16 pp

Laurel, antología de la poesía moderna en lengua española 2 v *México*: Ed Séneca, 1941. 1134 pp

León, Luis de.—La perfecta casada, ed Ramon Villaso *Buenos Aires*: Sopena, 1938 189 pp \$0.70 arg

Lipp, S, and Besso, H. V.—Conversational Spanish for Army Air Forces of the U S *New York*: Hastings House, 1941. xx + 168 pp

McHale, C. F.—Spanish don't's *New York*: Little & Ives, 1939 xi + 98 pp \$1.50

Maeztu, R. de.—Don Quijote, don Juan y la Celestina *Buenos Aires*: Espasa-Calpe, 1938 187 pp \$1.50 arg

Mazzei, P.—La poesia di Espronceda *Florence*. Nuova Italia (1939) 254 pp L 12.

Menéndez Pidal, R.—Estudios lit *Buenos Aires*: Espasa-Calpe, 1938. 272 pp. \$2.25 arg.

—Flor nueva de romances viejos *Ibid.*, 1938 316 pp. \$4.50 arg.

Obando, L. de.—Corrección del lenguaje. *Bogotá*: Imp. Nacional, 1938. 207 pp

Palomino Arana, H.—Tablas ortográficas, metodología y puntuación *Lima*: Ed. La Nacional, 1938. 219 pp 3 soles.

Pinochet, Le-Brum, F.—Crestomatia española I *Santiago de Chile*: Libr. Escolar, 1938. xxxvii + 298 pp.

Poesía española. Antología general, ed J. M. Souviron. *Santiago de Chile*: Ercilla, 1938. xxiv + 499 pp. \$40.00.

Ramírez, P. P.—Los Huarpes Etimología de las palabras usadas por el pueblo. *Buenos Aires*: Comisión de Cultura, 1938. 246 pp

Rocha, A. C. da.—Vocabulario comentado pilagá-castellano y castellano-pilagá *Buenos Aires*: Comisión de Indios, 1938 119 pp

Ruiz, Juan.—Libro de buen amor, ed. F. F. Corso. *Buenos Aires*: Libr. Perlado, 1939.

Ruppert y Ujaravi, R.—Spanische Synonymik für Studierende u. Lehrer. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1940. viii + 637 pp.

Solar Correa, E.—Lit. esp. I. *Santiago de Chile*: Imp. Univ., 1938 232 pp.

Thompson, A. R. & Arán, R.—Español práctico comercial *New York*: Longmans, Green, 1939. viii + 175 pp. \$1.50.

Vega, Lope de.—Del monte sale (quien el monte quema), ed. paleográfica de E. Le

Foit Peña *Buenos Aires* Libr La Facultad, 1939 220 pp

Velázquez Andrade, M.—Dicción "México Nuevo" de la lengua esp *México*: Pluma y Lápiz, 1938 630 pp

Willett, A. P. & Russo, F. A.—Sp. Composition and Conversation *New York*: Macmillan, 1939 184 pp. \$1.25.

PORTUGUESE

Azevedo, R. de.—Estudos de diplomática portuguesa. 2 v *Lisbon*: Imp Académica, 1935-8

Bacelar, J.—Da viabilidade do romance português de interesse universal. *Lisbon*: Seara Nova, 1939 123 pp

Camões, L. de.—I Lusíadi. Brani scelti, ed. J. M. Ruggieri *Modena*: Tip. Modenese, 1939

Campos, A. de.—Glossário de incertezas, novidades, curiosidades da lingua portuguesa. *Lisbon*: Bertrand, 1938 304 pp

Cidade, H.—A poesia lírica cultista y conceptista. *Lisbon*: Seara Nova, 1938. 63 pp.

Coutinho, B. X. C.—Biblog. franco-portugaise (livres fr. sur le Portugal). *Oporto*: Lopes da Silva, 1939 viii + 412 pp.

Ferreira, A.—Poemas lusitanos, ed. Marques Braga *Lisbon*: Sá da Costa, 1939. 262 pp

Grisalde, M.—Os nossos Poetas. III. Canções dispersas *Lisbon*: Beleza, 1938 viii + 76 pp.

Lacerda, A. de and Rogers, F. M.—Sons dependentes da fricativa palatal áfona, em português *Coimbra*: Fac. de Letras da U. de Coimbra, 1939 127 pp

Sá Nogueira, R. de.—Elementos para um tratado de fonética portuguesa *Lisbon*: Imp Nacional, 1938 xxxi + 380 pp

Torre Negra, H. M.—O maior erro de todas as edições de "Os Lusíadas" *Lisbon*: 1938 71 pp.

Vianna Moog, C.—Herois da decadência *Pôrto Alegre*: Globo, 1939. 223 pp.

GENERAL

Katsch, A. L.—Hebrew in American Higher Education *New York*: N. Y. U. Bookstore, 1941. 182 pp., lithotyped. \$1.00.

Pohl, Marta.—Gemeinsame Themen englisch-schottischer u. franz. Volksballaden Bonn diss., 1940 95 pp.

Reichenkron, G.—Beiträge zur romanischen Lautlehre *Leipzig*: Gronau, 1939. xiii + 198 pp.

Vossler, K.—Aus der romanischen Welt. 2 v. *Leipzig*: Koehler & Amelang, 1940. 160 + 170 pp.

